

Muskogee, Okla., favoring House bill 20644, to prohibit certain publications from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the Associated Employers of Indianapolis, in support of the militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Sauk County (Wis.) Country Life Association, favoring present method of rural free delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Carpenters' Union No. 82, of Haverhill, Mass., relative to unemployment in the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of St. James Council, No. 298, Knights of Columbus, relative to persecution of Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of citizens of Virginia, protesting against passage of H. R. 20644; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petition of William E. Cadmus, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against tone of recent notes from the State Department to English and German foreign offices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Protest of citizens of Perryville, Ark., against Fitzgerald amendment to Post Office appropriation bill relative to freedom of press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Coraopolis, Pa., protesting against bill to amend the postal law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: Petition from the members of the Lutheran St. Paul's Church, Beethoven Lodge, German-American Alliance, Torrington Lodge No. 462, D. O. H., all of Torrington, Conn., to prohibit the sale and export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John H. Rosenbeck and 60 others, of Torrington, Conn., favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition of Rev. L. D. Zimmerman and others, of Accident, Md., favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petitions of St. Joseph German Society, Bristol, and Deutscher Radfahrer Club Eichenlaub, of New Britain, Conn., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Nebraska, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of Socialist Party of Wichita, Kans., favoring legislation to meet the problem of the unemployed; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of board of directors, Associated Employers of Indianapolis, in support of militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of Mrs. M. J. Schroeder, 717 York Street, St. Paul, Minn., favoring exclusion of certain periodicals from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Harmonia Lodge, O. D. H. S., of Meriden, Conn., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of New Jersey Turn Bezirk, of Hoboken, N. J., relative to the neutrality of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of A. L. Ortman and Monmouth County Federation of Patriotic and Religious Fraternities, against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of Chris Harrigfield and others, citizens of Squirrel; E. M. Frank and others, of American Falls; Theodore Goers and others, all of Idaho, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Rev. W. M. Care and 17 citizens of Caldwell, and Rev. J. S. Colvin and 44 citizens of Hampa, all in the State of Idaho, protesting against employment of child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: Petition of members of St. Joseph's Catholic Church, Norman, Okla., and of St. Joseph's Cathedral, Oklahoma City, Okla., relative to circulation of certain publications through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of mass meeting of Bellevue, Iowa, against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 19, 1915.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. George H. Williams, of Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we thank Thee that under such auspicious circumstances we are again permitted to meet in this place. We pray Thy presence and blessing upon us and upon the deliberations of this august body. We pray that Thy holy Spirit may lead us in the way of Thy commandments, and that Thou wilt help us to do Thy will and to serve Thee in our day and generation. Forgive us all our sins, guide us by Thy holy Spirit through the remainder of our life, and after this life receive us into the eternal life. We ask it for the sake of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Amen.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smoot
Burleigh	Hollis	Oliver	Sterling
Camden	Hughes	Overman	Stone
Catron	Johnson	Owen	Swanson
Chamberlain	Jones	Page	Thomas
Clapp	Kenyon	Perkins	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Kern	Pittman	Warren
Crawford	La Follette	Poindexter	Weeks
Culberson	Lane	Robinson	White
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Root	Works
Fall	Lodge	Sheppard	
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Simmons	
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding session.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. OLIVER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it can be disposed of without trouble now, the Chair would like to call attention to the fact that the Journal of January 29 has never been approved.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state that I have that matter now on my desk, and I think it will be but a day or two before it can be finally decided. I realize the importance of disposing of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not want just now to start anything.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 21161) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 21161. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and, on motion of Mr. SHIVELY, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

CREDENTIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented the credentials of ELLISON D. SMITH, chosen by the electors of the State of South Carolina a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1915, which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, urging Congress to use all honorable and lawful means to compel the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a new bridge across the Missouri River at Chamberlain, S. Dak., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Associated Employers of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called

militia-pay bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MYERS. I present a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[House joint memorial No. 2—Introduced by Cavitt.]

Petition to Congress to enact legislation validating all desert-land claims made prior to March 23, 1914.

Resolved, That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana favors the enactment of a law by the Congress of the United States, giving title to all desert-land entrymen to claims filed prior to March 23, 1914. Entrymen having filed claims prior to this date mentioned, taking their water supply from dry coulees and other insufficient water sources shall not be denied title to said claims, provided that said entrymen have complied with the desert-land law in making the required improvements upon said claims: Therefore be it

Resolved, That an engrossed copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from the State of Montana.

GEORGE L. RAMSEY,
Speaker of the House.
W. W. McDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved February 5, 1915.

Filed February 5, 1915, at 2.05 o'clock p. m.

S. V. STEWART, Governor.
A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of House joint memorial No. 2, petitioning Congress to enact legislation validating all desert claims made prior to March 23, 1914, enacted by the fourteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 3d day of February, 1915.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 8th day of February, A. D. 1915.

[SEAL.]

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS. I present a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[House joint resolution No. 1—Introduced by Guinn.]

A resolution memorializing Congress for the building of one steel bridge jointly with the county of Big Horn across the Big Horn River on the Crow Indian Reservation.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States assembled:

Whereas the lands lying within the Crow Indian Reservation lie along the east bank of the Big Horn River, in Montana, and there dwell the major portion of the population of whites and Indians in the said reservation;

Whereas the county seat of Big Horn County is situated on the west side of the said Big Horn River, being by name the town of Hardin, the chief marketing and commercial center of the district aforementioned;

Whereas there are no means of communication from the Government lands of the Crow Indian Reservation and the said town of Hardin, except by a long devious route, which, in certain months of the year, is practically impassable;

Whereas by proclamation of the President there was thrown open for homesteading on the 25th day of October, 1914, the ceded portion of the Crow Indian Reservation, comprising about 200,000 acres; and

Whereas there are no means of ingress and egress to the said ceded strip from the said town of Hardin, the closest city or town of importance to the said ceded portion, except by fording the waters of the Big Horn River, which during the greater part of the year is a dangerous and unsafe proceeding: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fourteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring herein), That we petition the Congress of the United States for the necessary funds, to be taken out of Crow Indian moneys, enabling and directing the joint construction with the county of Big Horn, Mont., under the supervision of the Board of County Commissioners of Big Horn County, Mont., of one steel highway bridge across the Big Horn River, at a suitable and convenient place in the said county of Big Horn, one half of the expenses of the construction of said bridge to be paid out of the funds set aside and designated Crow Indian moneys and the other half of said expense to be paid out of the public treasury of the said county of Big Horn, under an agreement to be entered into between the proper Federal officers and the county commissioners of Big Horn County, Mont.

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of Montana to the Senate of the United States, and that a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of the State of Montana to the House of Representatives of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy hereof be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Montana, with the request that they use every

effort within their power to bring about a speedy action for the accomplishment of the ends and purposes herein indicated.

GEORGE L. RAMSEY,
Speaker of the House.
W. W. McDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved February 5, 1915.

Filed February 5, 1915, at 2.05 o'clock p. m.

S. V. STEWART, Governor.

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of Montana, ss:

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution memorializing Congress for the building of one steel bridge jointly with the county of Big Horn across the Big Horn River on the Crow Indian Reservation, enacted by the fourteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 5th day of February, 1915.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 8th day of February, A. D. 1915.

[SEAL.]

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS. I present a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Senate joint memorial No. 2—Introduced by Burla.]

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas the Crow Indian Reservation, situated in the southeastern portion of the State of Montana, comprising an area of approximately 2,875,000 acres, the major portion of which is of great agricultural value and capable of producing cereals and other farm products in great abundance, is now reserved for the use of the Crow Indian Tribe; and

Whereas the total membership of said Indian tribe is less than 1,600 persons, including men, women, and children; and

Whereas there has been allotted in severalty to each member of said tribe valuable lands, sufficient under a proper administration of their affairs to sustain said Indians in comfort and assure them the means of an independent livelihood; and

Whereas but a very small portion of said Indian reservation is ever used by any of said Indian tribe for any purpose whatsoever, the same being leased to large cattle owners and flock masters at a rental insignificant by comparison with the agricultural possibilities thereof; and

Whereas practically all of the available homestead lands of eastern Montana have been claimed and occupied under the homestead laws of the United States; and

Whereas it is physically impossible for this number of Indians to occupy and use this vast area of valuable farm land, even though said Indians were possessed of the average ability of our white citizens in the management of agricultural pursuits; and

Whereas it would result in the great betterment of the industrial, financial, and moral conditions of the Indians themselves if they were compelled to occupy, use, and manage under proper supervision the lands already allotted to them, large areas of which have been irrigated by the Government at great expense and are now almost wholly unused: Therefore be it

Resolved (the House of Representatives concurring), That we, the Fourteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States for the passage of necessary legislation to open for settlement at as early a date as practicable the land embraced within the Crow Indian Reservation, situated in the southeastern portion of the State of Montana.

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state to the honorable Secretary of the Interior and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, with the request that they use every effort within their power to bring about the early opening to homestead settlement or otherwise of said Crow Indian Reservation.

W. W. McDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE L. RAMSEY,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 9, 1915.

Filed February 9, 1915, at 3.50 o'clock p. m.

S. V. STEWART, Governor.

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.
By COPELAND C. BURG,
Deputy.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of Montana, ss:

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 2, memorializing Congress of the United States to pass the necessary legislation for the opening of the Crow Indian Reservation to settlement, enacted by the fourteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 9th day of February, 1915.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State. Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 10th day of February, A. D. 1915.

[SEAL.]

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS. I present a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[House joint memorial No. 4—Introduced by Healy.]

To the honorable Senators and Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas Cook City, Mont., has a population of 75 people, and Sluice Creek, Mont., a population of 4 people, and Clarks Fork, Wyo., a population of 25 people, all of whom have been deprived of any and all postal services by reason of the discontinuance of mails to the said Cook City, Mont., where all of said persons have heretofore received their mail;

Whereas the nearest post office to said Cook City and villages is Gardiner, Mont., which is a distance of 65 miles over mountain roads through the Yellowstone National Park; and

Whereas by reason of the great increase in the amount of mail to be carried to the above-mentioned points, caused by the introduction of the parcel post, the bid of the carrier was considered too high by the Post Office Department at Washington, D. C., and for that reason alone was rejected, and no further steps have been taken by the Government to restore such service; and

Whereas the discontinuance of the mail service to these points will mean the abandonment of one of the richest and most promising mining districts in the State of Montana and the consequent commercial loss to the Commonwealth and great injustice to the inhabitants of said towns and villages, compelling the abandonment of their homes and destruction of their means of support and the retardation of the growth and development of all the mining region around: Now therefore be it

Resolved (the senate concurring), That we, the Fourteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby petition Congress of the United States to take such immediate steps as are practicable to reestablish the postal service heretofore mentioned and bring the relief that the citizens of these communities demand and hereby correct the evil hereinabove referred to.

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy hereof be transmitted by the secretary of state to each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States at Washington, D. C., with the request that they use every effort within their power to bring about speedy action for the accomplishment of the ends and purposes herein indicated.

GEORGE L. RAMSEY,
Speaker of the House.
W. W. McDOWELL,
President of the Senate.

Approved February 9, 1915.

Filed February 9, 1915, at 3.50 o'clock p. m.

S. V. STEWART, Governor.
A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.
By COPELAND C. BURG,
Deputy.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 4, petitioning Congress to take such action or pass such laws as may be necessary to give the inhabitants of Cook City and vicinity relief by reestablishing a United States mail service to said place, enacted by the fourteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 9th day of February, 1915.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 10th day of February, A. D. 1915.

[SEAL.]

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Anaconda, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. OLIVER. I send to the desk a short telegram from the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., which I ask to have read.

There being no objection, the telegram was accordingly read, as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., February 18, 1915.

HON. GEORGE T. OLIVER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The business men of Pittsburgh at a largely attended special meeting of the chamber of commerce this afternoon, with few dissenting votes, adopted resolutions strongly opposing passage by Congress of proposed ship-purchase legislation. Your support and vote for defeat of legislation earnestly urged.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF PITTSBURGH,
LOGAN MCKEE, Secretary.

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of the City Council of Lebanon, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WORKS. I send to the desk a telegram from the California Branch of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, protesting against the proposed amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill providing for biennial promotions for post-office clerks. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., February 18, 1915.

HON. J. D. WORKS,
Senator from California, Washington, D. C.:

California Branch, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, earnestly oppose amendment of Senate Post Office Committee, which substitutes biennial for annual promotions for post-office clerks. Amendment is on page 14, lines 10 to 20, of Post Office bill. Amendment hits the lowest-priced clerks and carriers in the service.

Respectfully, yours,

JOSEPH RUDEE, President.

Mr. STERLING. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota relating to the construction of a permanent bridge by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway across the Missouri River at Chamberlain, S. Dak. I ask that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

I, Frank M. Rood, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the within resolution, to wit, house joint resolution No. 6, was duly passed by the 1915 session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, and that the same is now in full force and effect.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, at the city of Pierre, this 15th day of February, 1915.

[SEAL.]

FRANK M. ROOD,
Secretary of State.

A joint resolution memorializing Congress and our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use all honorable means to compel the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a permanent railway bridge across the Missouri River at the city of Chamberlain.

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota:

Whereas, about the year 1905, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., as the parent corporation of the White River Valley Railway Co., entered upon the construction of a line of railway commencing at the east bank of the Missouri River at the city of Chamberlain and extending westward through Lyman, Stanley, and Pennington Counties to the city of Rapid City, and as a part of said line of railway constructed a pontoon bridge across the Missouri River at Chamberlain; and

Whereas the said Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. has taken over the property of the White River Valley Railway Co., including the pontoon or pile bridge at Chamberlain, but has never constructed a permanent railroad bridge; and

Whereas the said pontoon or pile bridge goes out at least from one to four times each year when there is any unusual condition of the Missouri River at Chamberlain; and

Whereas said pontoon or pile bridge is unsafe and dangerous to the traveling public, and by reason of the maintenance of said bridge in its unsafe condition a railway train, either passenger or freight, is liable at any time to be precipitated in the Missouri River, especially during the early spring of the year, when the ice is going out, and during the June rise and in the fall of the year and when the ice is formed or floating in said river it is impossible to operate the draw in said bridge, and the maintenance of said bridge by the said railway company is inimical and dangerous to the public health and safety of the traveling public generally as well as to shippers; and

Whereas by reason of the fact that all traffic to points west of the Missouri River, when said bridge is out or the draw open, must be sent via the lines of the Chicago & North Western Railway Co. via Wolsey and Rapid City to consignees between Chamberlain and Rapid City, and passengers, mail, express, and freight are thereby greatly delayed and the development of said country deterred and the business interests of the people located between Chamberlain and Rapid City jeopardized: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, That the Congress of the United States and our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and hereby are, urged to use all honorable and lawful means at their command to compel the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to erect at the earliest possible date a good, safe, permanent railway bridge across the Missouri River at Chamberlain; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Congress of the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the Secretary of War.

Mr. STERLING presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from H. H. McLain, of Loomis; of the Post Office Clerks' Association of Sioux Falls; of the Railway Mail Association of Aberdeen, all in the State of South Dakota, and of the Tenth Division of the Railway Mail Association of Watertown, Wis., remonstrating against a change in the annual promotion of postal clerks, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WALSH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Butte, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES presented petitions of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MCLEAN presented petitions of the Deutsch-Ungerischen Militair Verein, of New Britain; of Harmonia Lodge, O. D. H. S.,

of Meriden; of the German Schaal Society, of New Britain; and of sundry citizens of New Britain, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Danbury, Conn., remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 5 with the original thereof filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oregon on the 8th day of February, 1915, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 8th day of February, A. D. 1915.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.
By S. A. KOZER, Deputy.

House joint memorial No. 5.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represents that—

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States a bill entitled "A bill to increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, and for other purposes" (S. 6217); and

Whereas the purpose of the law proposed by said bill is to provide for the payment of the Organized Militia of the United States; and Whereas the state of the national defense requires that a more dependable military reserve be created than exists at the present time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That your memorialists do favor enactment of a Federal law providing for payment and reorganizing national reserve. That we do hereby declare that, in our opinion, the above-mentioned bill is designed to create such a dependable military reserve as is desired and to greatly increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, and that it is necessary to the national welfare that the Congress of the United States shall at the earliest possible date pass the said act, and the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of Oregon are hereby requested to aid and assist in the passage of said bill, and for the passage of such a law your memorialists will ever pray.

Adopted by the House January 28, 1915.

BEN SELLING,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the Senate February 3, 1915.

W. LAIR THOMPSON,
President of the Senate.

(Indorsed:) House joint memorial No. 5, W. F. Drager, chief clerk. Filed February 8, 1915, at 2.45 o'clock p. m. Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state, by S. A. Kozzer, deputy.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 4 with the original thereof filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oregon on the 8th day of February, 1915, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 8th day of February, A. D. 1915.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.
By S. A. KOZER, Deputy.

House joint memorial No. 4.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully request that—

Whereas the Hon. David F. Houston, Secretary of Agriculture, in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, recommends as follows:

"In regions where timber is the chief income-producing resource absence of demand for it often works a serious hardship upon those who have entered the region as the advance guard of civilization and are seeking, in the face of many difficulties, to establish homes. There are counties in which a sparse local population of pioneer settlers find themselves surrounded by a wilderness largely consisting

of national-forest land, which is almost idle, so far as any form of present use is concerned. In other words, a great if not the greatest of the potential sources of wealth in such counties, held in trust by the Government for the benefit of the public, not merely contributes nothing now to the upbuilding of the communities which will give value to the forests, but actually adds to the burden which these communities must assume. Were the national forests private property, they would pay their fair proportion of the cost of road development, public schools, and other public activities through taxation. The Government, unlike the private owner of timberland in such regions, is holding the timber, not in order to make a profit later by its advance in value, but in order to make it promote the public welfare. That it should be made to serve the local as well as the national public welfare has been definitely recognized in the provisions of law for the use of 35 per cent of all gross receipts from the forests for local public purposes.

"To carry more fully into effect this already established principle a further step should be taken. It should not be necessary to wait until the period of hardest struggle is past before these public resources begin to yield large incomes, as well as after, they should be made to participate in the work of building up the country and giving value to all its resources.

"The first need of the public in undeveloped regions is for more and better roads. Without them the struggle of individuals to gain a foothold is much more difficult, while isolation from neighbors and the outside world means meager educational opportunity, a lack of comforts, and conditions unfavorable to community life. A road system, however, constitutes a capital investment which a handful of settlers must make a little at a time. When their roads must be built largely through national-forest lands, which pay no taxes, their case is much more difficult. In such regions the Secretary of Agriculture should be authorized to make a study of the local conditions and to gather all the data necessary to formulate a plan for public-road development based on local needs. These plans should be carried into sufficient detail to provide a reasonably accurate estimate of the cost of the road construction which it is proposed that the Government undertake. They should be accompanied by careful and conservative appraisals of the value of the national-forest timber in each locality and a forecast of the future income which the forests will bring in from all sources. On the basis of the showings of fact regarding the value of the Government's property, its potential income-yielding capacity, and the needs of the public, Congress should be asked to appropriate for the construction of specific projects recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture. The cost of such road construction by the Government should constitute an advance of the amounts which the forests would later make available for local use. In effect, therefore, the roads would become an obligation upon the forests, to be extinguished as their resources come into commercial demand."

Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That our Representatives and Senators in Congress be, and are hereby, memorialized and requested to use their best endeavors to see that the honorable the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make a study of local conditions necessary to formulate plans for public-road development and to report his findings to Congress from time to time in accordance with his recommendations. Be it further Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby instructed to transmit by mail a copy of this resolution to each of the Oregon delegates in Congress.

Adopted by the house January 28, 1915.

BEN SELLING,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 3, 1915.

W. LAIR THOMPSON,
President of the Senate.

(Indorsed:) House joint memorial No. 4, W. F. Drager, chief clerk. Filed February 8, 1915, at 2.45 o'clock p. m. Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state, by S. A. Kozzer, deputy.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Newport and Gresham, in the State of Oregon, remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against the curtailment of the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect the national flag, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask to have printed in the RECORD a statement to the press by Secretary McAdoo on the shipping bill; a telegram from W. W. Marsh to the Secretary of the Treasury; a telegram from the Chamber of Commerce of Athens, Ga.; a letter from W. B. Merritt, vice president and general manager of the West Bay Naval Stores & Lumber Co., of St. Andrew, Fla.; and a copy of a letter from the Syracuse Smelting Works addressed to the Secretary of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT TO THE PRESS BY SECRETARY M'ADOO.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 18, 1915.

Secretary McAdoo said:

"On Sunday, February 14, 1915, the New York Herald, which has been one of the champions of the opposition to the shipping bill, published a grossly libelous article, in which it sought to convey the impression that the Secretary of the Treasury was interested, with bankers in New York, in an effort to sell to the Government the interned German vessels if the shipping bill should be passed. In this article the Herald attributed certain statements to Senator BRISTOW. The attached correspondence with Senator BRISTOW shows that the Herald deliberately falsified in order to accomplish its purpose.

"I make this statement in order that the public may get an idea of the methods which have been employed by the opponents of the shipping bill to prevent its passage."

Hon. JOSEPH L. BRISTOW,
United States Senate.

SIR: The New York Herald of Sunday, February 14, 1915, alleged that you made the following statement to a Herald reporter:
"It is a matter of common knowledge that Mr. McAdoo is very close to the New York banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of which Paul M. Warburg was formerly a director, and is working to have the United States purchase these German ships."

Permit me to ask if you made this statement?

Respectfully,

W. G. MCADOO.

FEBRUARY 15, 1915.

Hon. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your note of February 15. In reply I beg to say that I have never said that you were "working to have the United States purchase these German ships."

With kindest regards, I am,
Very truly, yours,

JOSEPH L. BRISTOW.

FEBRUARY 17, 1915.

Hon. JOSEPH L. BRISTOW,
United States Senate.

SIR: Your note dated February 15, in reply to my note of that date, was received at the Treasury Department at 10.14 a. m. to-day.

You say: "I beg to say that I have never said that you (I) were 'working to have the United States purchase these German ships.'"

You do not, however, answer my question as to whether or not you made the following statement, which the Herald, in its publication of February 14, attributes to you: "It is a matter of common knowledge that Mr. McAdoo is very close to the New York banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of which Paul M. Warburg was formerly a director."

Permit me to ask you again if you made this statement.

This letter will be delivered to you by messenger.

Respectfully,

W. G. MCADOO.

FEBRUARY 17, 1915.

Hon. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your note of February 17 is received. I did not make the statement contained therein.

Very truly, yours,

JOSEPH L. BRISTOW.

WATERLOO, IOWA, February 18, 1915.

Hon. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.:

I am mailing to-day to Senator KENTON correspondence and statement showing our shipments to London were tied up for 10 weeks; that we have had orders unfilled and no shipping accommodations obtainable; that our men need work, and if we could have shipping facilities they would be at work; that our capital is tied up in consequence; and that he give the shipping bill his support.

W. W. MARSH.

ATHENS, GA., February 16, 1915.

Senator D. U. FLETCHER, Washington, D. C.:

The Athens Chamber of Commerce unanimously passed strong resolution indorsing administration ship-purchase bill, believing its passage of vital importance to the farming, manufacturing, and laboring interests of the South at a critical moment. Our committee is instructed to inform you of this resolution and urge your most ardent support.

JOHN D. MOSS,
ANDREW C. ERWIN,
BLANTON FORTSON,
Committee.

WEST BAY NAVAL STORES & LUMBER CO.,
St. Andrew, Fla., February 6, 1915.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your constituents appreciate the stand you are taking in the ship-purchase bill. We are suffering for shipping facilities and on account of exorbitant marine freight rates.

Yours, very truly,

W. B. MERRITT.

NEW YORK, February 15, 1915.

Hon. W. C. REDFIELD,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your name was given to us by Mr. E. C. Porter, of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and we take the liberty of addressing you in reference to the ship-purchase bill. As shippers of our manufactured products all over the world, we feel that this country certainly requires a bill of that kind, as, in the first place, the shipping is in the hands of such a lot of financiers, who handle these matters just as they please; in fact, at the present time shipments that have to be made to the Continent—when you inquire from any of the steamship companies they simply name you a high figure and request

you to engage space promptly. Otherwise they simply tell you that the rate will be higher; and sure enough, when you find in a few days that you can make the shipments and you inquire from them for space, up goes the price. So the more times you inquire the higher rates you have to pay.

This is now getting to be unbearable, and believe that if the ship-purchase bill was passed that in due time the manufacturers and shippers of this country would at least be relieved from being held up to such an extent, and trust that you will make a special effort to see that this bill is passed.

Yours, truly,

SYRACUSE SMELTING WORKS,
Per L. SAFERY.

INSPECTION OF GRAIN.

Mr. GORE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17971) for securing the uniform grading of grain, preventing deception in transactions in grain, and regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1014) thereon.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 547, submitted by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], to report it favorably with an amendment, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Senate by unanimous consent proceeded to consider the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-third Congress to subpoena witnesses, to send for books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a price not to exceed \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had or may have been had in connection with any subject which may be pending or may have been pending before the said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and the expense thereof shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The amendment was, in line 9, after the word "sessions," to strike out the words "or recesses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

JOHN BURROWS.

Mr. WHITE. From the Committee on Claims I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 17122) for the relief of John Burrows, and I submit a report (No. 1011) thereon. This is an emergency bill; it applies to a man who was an employee of the Government in the Canal Zone. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to pay to John Burrows, of New Orleans, La., \$1,433.33, to compensate him for injuries received while in the employ of the Government on the Panama Canal.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PORT OF NYANDU, N. Y.

Mr. NELSON. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (H. R. 17982) to make Nyando, N. Y., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisement, and I submit a report (No. 1012) thereon. I call the attention of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] to the report.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill. In explanation I will say that it is identical with the bill reported on the 12th of December last from the Committee on Commerce by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], which is now on the calendar, being Senate bill 6528.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, what is the bill?

Mr. ROOT. It is a bill making Nyando, on the St. Lawrence River, a port of entry.

Mr. STONE. Very well.

There being no objection the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Shall Senate bill 6528 of the same title and for the same purpose be indefinitely postponed? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

CAPT. THOMAS MOORE.

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 205) to convey the thanks of Congress to Capt. Thomas Moore, master of the Alaska Steamship Co. steamer *Cordova*, and to the officers and crew, for the prompt and heroic service rendered by them in rescuing 58 survivors of the United

States revenue cutter *Tahoma*, and I submit a report (No. 1013) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] to the report.

Mr. JONES. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the thanks of Congress be, and the same are hereby, extended to Capt. Thomas Moore and the officers and crew of the steamer *Cordova*, belonging to the Alaska Steamship Co., for their heroic rescue of 58 survivors of the United States revenue cutter *Tahoma*, shipwrecked near the coast of Alaska; and that duly certified copies of this resolution be sent to Capt. Thomas Moore and to the officers and members of his crew participating in this rescue.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT JUDGE FOR NEW JERSEY.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 7091) to create an additional judge in the district of New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, is there a report with the bill?

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator from New York that he was a member of the subcommittee which reported the bill favorably to the full committee. There is a favorable report on the bill from the Judiciary Committee. I have the manuscript of the report here, which I can read if it is thought necessary.

Mr. ROOT. Very well; I have no objection to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It authorizes the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the district of New Jersey, who shall reside in the district, and whose term of office, compensation, duties, and powers shall be the same as now provided by law for the judge of the district.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POST-OFFICE BUILDING AT SEYMOUR, IND.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I should like to call up Calendar No. 868, being the bill (H. R. 18172) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Seymour, Ind. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill. There is an emergency existing calling for immediate action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Seymour, Ind., \$15,000, to meet the additional cost of construction of the building by the substitution of stone instead of brick with stone trimmings, as specified in the existing specification.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 7682) to repeal sections 35 to 49, inclusive, of the act of June 13, 1898, concerning mixed flour, as amended by act of April 12, 1902; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEA of Tennessee:

A bill (S. 7683) for the relief of E. D. Judkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 7684) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to appoint a commission to negotiate with the Crow Indians for the cession of their lands lying west of the Big Horn River on the Crow Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 7685) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Estes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 7687) authorizing the Secretary of War to make donation of condemned cannon and cannon balls to the Odessa (Wash.) public schools; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 7688) for the relief of Augustus G. Reynolds; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7689) granting an increase of pension to Emiles Pomeroy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 7690) granting an increase of pension to Leroy F. Morse; to the Committee on Pensions.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF PISTOLS.

Mr. SHIELDS. I introduce the bill which I send to the desk, and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The bill (S. 7686) to regulate interstate commerce in pistols, revolvers, and other firearms of like form, size, and description, was read the first time by title and the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

A bill (S. 7686) to regulate interstate commerce in pistols, revolvers, and other firearms of like form, size, and description.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person or corporation to deliver, or cause to be delivered, to any common carrier, or to deposit in the mails of the United States, to be carried from any State or Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia to another State or Territory of the United States or from any State or Territory to the District of Columbia for the purpose of sale, or in the performance of a contract of sale, a pistol, revolver, or other firearm of like form, size, or description, except those which for the time being have been adopted and are commonly used in the Army and Navy of the United States, under the rules and regulations of the constituted authorities of the Departments of War and Navy.

Sec. 2. That it shall be unlawful for any person or corporation engaged in the business of a common carrier in interstate commerce to receive for transportation or to transport from any State or the District of Columbia to another State or from a State to the District of Columbia a pistol, revolver, or other firearm of like form and size described in the first section of this act.

Sec. 3. That any person or corporation or their agents or employees violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and the offending party fined not less than \$100 nor more than \$500, and, if a person, imprisoned not less than 30 days nor more than 6 months, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word concerning the object of the bill and to offer some statistics respecting it.

Hon. Andrew White, in an interview given to Mr. Karl K. Kitchin, appearing in the *World*, of New York, commenting upon the frequency of criminal homicides in the United States, said:

I repeat that this annual wholesale murder is the most disgraceful evil in America to-day, and conditions are rapidly becoming worse. Ten years ago there were only 117 murders to the million. To-day there are 126. Ten years ago 1 in every 74 cases punished; to-day only 1 in 86 meets the penalty prescribed by law.

That this condition is due largely to the lax manner in which our criminal laws are enforced there is no doubt. Across an imaginary line in Canada there are only seven murders to the million annually. There British law deals with criminals quickly and effectively. It is a pity we do not do likewise.

As long as this condition holds true our Declaration of Independence is a joke. In that great document it is stated that all great men are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Yet without life the pursuit of liberty and happiness are, of course, impossible. The United States to-day has the highest percentage of murders of any country in the world. Even southern Italy, with its Camorristi and Mafias, does not have as many murders in proportion to the population as our country.

The object of this bill is to aid in the prevention and suppression of this crime. The statistics show that something like three-fifths of all felonious homicides are committed with pistols and revolvers, smaller than the size used in the Army and Navy of the United States, carried concealed about the person.

A majority of the States have laws prohibiting the sale and carrying of these small firearms, but they find it difficult to enforce them, chiefly because of the facility with which pistols can be purchased and received through the mails and interstate carriers, which will be prohibited if this bill becomes a law.

This legislation is along the lines of acts of Congress regulating the transportation by common carriers engaged in interstate commerce of dynamite and other explosives and dangerous articles, and excluding from the mails obscene, lascivious, and filthy pictures and publications, lottery tickets, advertisements, poisons, explosives, intoxicating liquors, and other similar legislation.

I believe if the transportation of pistols and revolvers of the character described in this bill is prohibited in interstate commerce and the mails of the United States, it will greatly con-

tribute to the suppression of felonious assaults and homicides. It is well known that many such crimes would not be committed if boys and men were not so armed. There is no reason why the manufacture and sale of these arms should not be discouraged and, as far as possible, suppressed. They are not manufactured or sold for any useful purpose. They are chiefly used in committing violent assaults and murderous assassinations. No man carries concealed weapons about his person for any other purpose. If he desires to go armed for a just and lawful purpose, he can carry the larger firearms and will do so. The right of the citizen to have arms in the home and to carry them for self-defense is not interfered with in the slightest by this bill.

Such a law as this has more merit than those prohibiting the transportation of explosives, liquors, and poisonous drugs, because they may be used for a lawful purpose, while pistols are expressly intended for unlawful and felonious purposes.

Whatever can be done for the suppression of violent assaults and felonious homicides in the United States ought to be done. The punishment of these offenses is peculiarly within the province of the States, but the General Government ought not to allow agencies under its control to be used in furnishing the means commonly used in the commission of these crimes. It ought to, in so far as it can, aid the States in the prevention and suppression of what is sometimes called the "national crime."

I present some statistics and data concerning the frequency of homicides in the United States, which I ask to have printed in the Record without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SHIELDS. Judge S. C. Brown, one of the circuit judges of Tennessee, in discussing the evil of concealed weapons, recently said:

All agree that pistol carrying is one of the greatest banes to civilization and makes life entirely too cheap. As a rule, most of the pistol cases in our courts are without excuse. The young fellow begins to carry a pistol and he does not know why he carries it. He wonders why he does so, and finally concludes that he is carrying it for self-defense, and it is not long then until he has a case of self-defense, or is found dead in front of another man's pistol, who likewise has a case of self-defense.

As it is there is but little uniformity in enforcing the statute against carrying pistols. The discretion given the courts as to jail sentence destroys the efficacy of the law. The law will be ineffective so long as it now stands and is administered. It will continue to be violated while the great loss of life and the happiness of homes will be sacrificed as a result. There should be a positive uniformity and certainty in its enforcement in every county in the State.

When we put pistol carrying on the same plane as the bowie knife and Arkansas toothpick, then, and not until then, will the pistol be relegated from use as these two outlawed weapons have been.

It was by virtue of chapter 137, acts 1838, page 200, that the bowie knife and Arkansas toothpick were completely outlawed in Tennessee. It was the purpose of the act, as indicated in the caption, "to suppress the sale and use of bowie knives and Arkansas toothpicks in this State." That act did suppress the use of pistols forever in Tennessee.

By reading the original act it is seen that it was the sole purpose of the act to do what it did:

Section 1: For selling or offering to sell these weapons fixes the fine from \$100 to \$500 and jail sentence from one to six months.

Section 2: For wearing these weapons concealed about the person fixes the fine from \$200 to \$500 and jail sentence from three to six months.

Section 3: For maliciously drawing or attempting to draw these weapons from under the clothes or place of concealment about the person for the purpose of sticking, cutting, or awing another person makes the offense a felony from three to five years in the penitentiary.

Section 4: For cutting or stabbing another with these weapons in a sudden encounter, whether death ensues or not, makes the offense a felony from 3 to 15 years in the penitentiary.

Of course these sections are found in the code of 1858 and in Shannon's Compilation, but a more comprehensive view as to the purpose of the act is obtained by studying the original act, which purpose is distinctly stated in the caption as above quoted.

Our supreme court in *Day v. State* (5 Sneed, 496) held in a vigorous opinion delivered by Judge Caruthers that a person indicted under this act for drawing a bowie knife from a place of concealment about his person to cut or intimidate another can not have resort to the plea of self-defense; that the law makes no exception and the courts must enforce it as it is. Judge Caruthers says that the legislature intended to abolish these weapons entirely from use. It was contended in that case that if drawn in self-defense, not maliciously, that self-defense could be relied upon, but the supreme court said in that case that the right of self-defense is not denied by the act, but this particular instrument is prohibited in the exercise of that right if it be drawn from any place of concealment about the person and be thus drawn with malice for the purpose of "awing or intimidating any person," and if this be shown the offense is complete. The court again says that "if the statute invades the right of self-defense the fault is not ours"; that it is no fault of the courts; that the statute must be enforced as it reads.

When the legislature puts the pistol in the same class with the bowie knife and the Arkansas toothpick pistol carrying will be over in Tennessee the same as these two relegated instruments of death. Not only the carrying but the use of the pistol must be suppressed.

Of course it is likely that an act for this purpose should allow the Army and Navy pistol to be carried openly and in the hand and likewise except from its provisions sheriffs and other officers of the law while executing process and in arresting criminals as now excepted by the pistol statute.

I am firmly of the conviction that if these suggestions be written into the statutes of Tennessee that great results will follow in reclaiming the criminal youth of the State and in forever banishing from its borders the murderous use of the pistol.

The Nashville Banner, a paper published in the capital city of my State, commented upon this interview of Judge Brown, as follows:

Judge S. C. Brown, of the fourth judicial circuit, in an article on another page, makes some suggestions which his experience on the bench has led him to believe is much needed legislation.

One of these suggestions is that the law against carrying a pistol be given the same penalty as that provided for carrying a "bowie knife or Arkansas toothpick." The last-named weapon has been virtually extirpated by the severity of the punishment the law prescribes for having it concealed about the person, and Judge Brown considers that pistol carrying should be made a like offense.

The Banner wishes to indorse the suggestion. There is no reason why anyone should carry a pistol, and the practice has been prolific of homicides that might have been otherwise avoided.

The pistol is purely and simply an implement for shooting men. It is not put to any other use. It is meant, too, for private quarrels, and has little or no place in war. Except as it may be needed by the police and constabulary, nothing of the kind should be tolerated by modern civilization.

The sale of pistols is forbidden by law in Tennessee, but like other wholesome laws in this State it is little enforced and has slack observance. Pistols are frequently publicly exposed for sale in low-grade pawn shops, where they are bought by tough characters, and they can be had by those who desire to make the purchase from places of greater pretensions to respectability.

The law against the sale of pistols should be strictly enforced, and it would be well if some statute in accord with Judge Brown's suggestion were enacted that made more weighty the penalty for carrying a pistol concealed about the person.

The Banner quite recently reproduced some statistics given by the New York World showing the great preponderance of homicides in America over European countries, and making the startling disclosure that Memphis, in proportion to population, leads the cities of the civilized world in that unenviable respect, while Nashville is third in the list.

That is an alarming evil that should assuredly be overcome, and the remedy lies largely in abolishing the pistol.

Men who carry pistols as an imagined necessity for defense are more often drawn into difficulties than they are saved from attack by the habit.

A perfect enforcement and universal observance of the law would make self-defense unnecessary, and a condition of affairs where men must be their own defenders always abounds in feuds and violent personal encounters.

Judge Brown's suggestion in this respect is full of good sense and should be given thoughtful consideration by the legislature.

The Literary Digest of October 19, 1912, concerning an article appearing in the Spectator prepared by Mr. L. F. Hoffman, said:

Why is the ratio of murders to population in the United States increasing? Why is it so much higher than in England and Wales? Why is the rate highest in our southern cities? These are some of the questions puzzling our editors since the publication in a New York insurance journal called the Spectator of Mr. L. F. Hoffman's comparative table of homicide statistics in 30 American cities. Mr. Hoffman shows that in the decade from 1881 to 1891 the number of homicides among our urban population averaged 5 to every 100,000 persons, that for the next 10 years the rate dropped to 4.0, and that during the decade ending with 1910 it rose again to 7.2. This rate, declares Mr. Hoffman, indicates "a startling disregard of human life in the United States." For England and Wales, he says, the average rate of homicides is only 0.9 per 100,000 inhabitants. The condition revealed by these figures, he maintains, "is not compatible with the common assumption that actual progress is being made in the United States in all that is summed up under the term 'civilization and national welfare.'" We print herewith Mr. Hoffman's figures for the 30 selected cities during the period 1901-10 and for the single year 1911, giving the actual number of homicides, the rate per 100,000 population, and the ratio of increase. It will be seen that Memphis, Tenn., has the highest homicide rate (47.1 per 100,000 for the decade and 63.4 for 1911), and that six other southern cities follow it on the list. Why are the people of the South more given to manslaughter than those of the North? On this point the Charleston News and Courier comments as follows:

"The homicide record of the South and of southern cities is bad enough when accompanied by the fullest explanation of the conditions existing in this part of the country; but when, as in the current number of the Spectator, the bald figures are published the effect is appalling. It is scarcely just to print, as does this New York insurance magazine, articles such as that of Mr. F. L. Hoffman giving the homicide record of American cities unaccompanied by explanatory notes. Reading Mr. Hoffman's article one is uninformed as to the facts can gather no other impression than that in Memphis, Charleston, Savannah, New Orleans, Atlanta, Louisville, and Nashville, in the order named, human life is cheaper than anywhere else in America, a land in no part of which is human life held very sacred. We are not prepared to attack Mr. Hoffman's figures. Indeed, we take it that they are essentially correct; but we do think that it would have been only fair for him to have explained, as he could have done in a line, that the homicide record of these southern cities is high because their negro population is larger proportionately than that of any other cities considered by him in his article. Of course, it is deplorable that 24 homicides should have occurred in Charleston in 1911; but surely it makes a difference to insurance companies as well as to the public in general that of these 24 homicides 20 of the victims were colored, and only 2 of the known assailants, all told, were white. Whatever other criticisms may legitimately be directed against the white people of this community, they are not given to crimes of violence in larger degree than are their neighbors of the North, the East, or the West."

"But while this defense is Charleston's due, it remains lamentably true that in the South, as in every other part of America, there is lacking that regard for the sacredness of life which should characterize a people claiming to be civilized. The figures make painful reading, because they indicate conditions to be growing worse instead of better."

Viewing the situation broadly, the New York Times thinks that the increase in homicides, while disheartening, "is probably explainable on

other grounds than the degeneracy of the Nation." As the Times sees it:

"The percentage of homicides per 100,000 of the population of our larger cities increased between 1882 and 1911 from 5.5 to 8.3. The increase of immigration from southern Europe in these years was enormous. The concentration of the population in the large cities had grown greatly in that period. In Memphis, Tenn., the city which has the worst record for homicides, the negro population is very large. We are not to infer that the white citizens of American birth and training have taken to killing each other more frequently in the last 30 years.

"But there have been causes for the increase of murder. Labor strikes have been more common than formerly, and have often been accompanied by bloodshed. It is claimed, however, that the tables printed in the Spectator by Mr. F. L. Hoffman and reproduced in the Times yesterday ought to make us more lenient judges of Mexico and Central America when we get news of manslaughter in those troubled countries. Throughout the United States the ease with which slayers of men escape punishment has become a grave scandal."

"We can check the increase of murder just as soon as we make would-be murderers know that punishment will be sure and swift, and we can check it in no other way," declares the New York World. The American Prison Association's committee on criminal procedure reports that not 1 out of 4 murderers in the United States is brought to trial, and that out of 25 brought to trial only 1 receives a death sentence. According to the same authority, 10,000 homicides are committed in this country every year, more than the aggregate number for any 10 civilized nations, exclusive of Russia.

The Spectator, in a recent number, had an article containing statistics upon the subject of homicides, which I ask to be inserted in the RECORD.

The article referred to is as follows:

HOMICIDE RECORD OF AMERICAN CITIES—STATISTICS SHOW HOMICIDE RATE HAS REMAINED FAIRLY SATISFACTORY SINCE 1907—HOWEVER, SECOND MAXIMUM POINT REACHED IN 1913.

[By Frederick L. Hoffman.]

It has properly been observed that for the United States there are no general statistics as to crime "which are not more misleading than they are informing." There are no judicial statistics for the country, as a whole, which afford an insight into one of the most important phases of modern life. The study of abnormal man is of equal importance with the study of the normal type, for the one can not be fully understood without a thorough understanding of the other. There are inherent difficulties in all efforts to bring about strictly comparable international statistics of crime. What constitutes a wrongful act in one country may not be subject to punishment in another. The legal definition of homicide varies considerably, not only in different countries, but also in the several States of the United States. It would seem that homicide would constitute the least difficult branch of criminal statistics. A homicide, in the most extensive sense of the word, is the killing of any human creature, irrespective of intent. In the trial of persons accused of homicide the required distinction is made as to whether the homicide is excusable or whether it is justifiable or whether it is felonious. From an insurance point of view this distinction, which seriously affects the statistical consideration of homicide as a social problem, is of relatively small importance. Claims have to be paid whether the homicide was justified or felonious. Judicial statistics have to do with the person committing the homicide, whereas in mortality statistics it is a question of the person murdered, irrespective of the degree of moral or legal responsibility for the act. For this reason judicial statistics are of less value than accurate and conclusive mortality statistics, by means of which it is possible to establish the true loss of life by violence.

The fundamental basis of all mortality statistics is the death certificate filed by the attending physician. Where there is reason to suspect death by wrongful means a coroner's inquest is, as a rule, called for; but, unfortunately, the verdict rendered by a coroner's jury is frequently based upon superficially considered evidence. Under a system of qualified medical examiners, such as prevails in certain New England States, a material improvement is brought about, both in the administration of justice and the accurate and complete registration of violent deaths. At the present time the statistics of deaths due to homicide in the United States are wanting in accuracy and completeness. There are abundant reasons for believing that some violent deaths are returned as accidents because of the reluctance on the part of the jurors to establish a felonious crime. The available statistical information, therefore, in all probability understates the true facts of a most serious social and economic problem.

The most useful data are the returns of the Division of Vital Statistics of the Census for the registration area of the United States. Combining the returns for the decade ending with 1912, the average homicide mortality rate was 5.5 per 100,000 of population. For males the rate was 8.4 and for females 2.4. For the urban territory of the registration States (including Connecticut, District of Columbia, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont) the rate was 5, and for the rural 2.5. These rates are based upon an area which excludes the entire urban and rural South. The rate, therefore, when applied to the continental United States, as a whole, underestimates the number of homicidal deaths in the country at large.

The vital statistics of the census have been published since 1900. There has been a gradual and persistent increase in the homicide mortality rates during that period. In part this increase is the result of improved methods of death registration and death certification. This explanation, however, does not seriously impair the important conclusion that murder is on the increase in the United States, and that actually, as well as relatively, homicides were never so frequent in this country as they are at the present time.

Combining the returns for 30 representative American cities for the year 1913, the homicide mortality rate for this group was 8.7 per 100,000 of population. This rate is the highest on record since 1884, with the exception of the year 1907, when the rate was 8.8. For the year 1912 the homicide death rate, as returned by the census for the United States registration area was 6.5 per 100,000 of population. When this rate is applied to the total population of the continental United States the approximate number of deaths due to murder for that year was 6,250. Since, however, the rate during 1913 was 0.4 per 100,000 of population in excess of the urban rate for 1912, the number of deaths from homicide in the continental United States during the year 1913 must have been considerably higher. The table following shows the homicide record of 30 American cities for which the information is

obtainable with more or less completeness for the 30 years ending with 1913:

Year.	Number of cities.	Aggregate population.	Homicides.	Rate per 100,000.
1884.....	18	6,117,495	372	6.1
1885.....	18	6,471,447	345	5.3
1886.....	21	7,100,317	357	5.0
1887.....	20	7,269,735	373	5.1
1888.....	22	7,808,836	363	4.6
1889.....	21	8,008,103	372	4.6
1890.....	24	8,561,164	434	5.1
1891.....	21	8,600,435	365	4.2
1892.....	24	9,477,236	440	4.6
1893.....	25	9,795,223	478	4.9
1894.....	23	9,905,442	444	4.5
1895.....	23	9,911,241	482	4.9
1896.....	27	11,017,031	520	4.7
1897.....	24	10,636,379	451	4.2
1898.....	25	11,207,621	594	5.3
1899.....	26	11,580,321	587	5.1
1900.....	26	11,704,655	642	5.5
1901.....	28	12,450,541	591	4.7
1902.....	28	12,824,531	627	4.9
1903.....	30	13,280,572	705	5.3
1904.....	29	13,248,161	728	5.5
1905.....	29	13,872,240	923	6.7
1906.....	29	13,957,944	1,107	7.9
1907.....	30	14,728,792	1,294	8.8
1908.....	30	15,112,384	1,229	8.1
1909.....	30	15,495,977	1,156	7.5
1910.....	30	15,879,566	1,312	8.3
1911.....	30	16,263,155	1,371	8.4
1912.....	30	16,645,668	1,384	8.3
1913.....	30	17,029,158	1,477	8.7
1884-1893.....	79,209,991	3,899	4.9
1894-1903.....	114,527,334	5,643	4.9
1904-1913.....	152,233,045	11,981	7.9

The table brings out the interesting fact that the homicide rate of 30 American cities has gradually increased from a minimum of 4.2 per 100,000 of population in 1891 to a maximum of 8.8 in 1907. Since that year the rate has remained fairly stationary, but a second maximum point was reached in 1913, when the rate attained to 8.7. Considered by decennial periods, it is shown that the average rate remained the same during the first 20 years, but that the rate increased from 4.9 to 7.9 during the last decade. The increase is, no doubt, in part the result of improved methods of registration, tabulation, and death certification. It also requires to be taken into account that for the earlier years of the comparison the returns are not for all of the 30 cities for which they have been complete since 1907. In a general way the table justifies the conclusion that a fairly stationary condition has been reached in the homicide rate, and that the increase during recent years can not be considered seriously alarming, unless compared or contrasted with the returns for the earlier period. Accepting, however, the present returns as accurate, it may safely be maintained that the position of the United States in the matter of violent deaths is decidedly deplorable. Every international comparison proves that the homicide rate of the United States is probably the highest for any civilized country in the world.

The following table exhibits the comparative homicide rates for 30 American cities, first, for the decade ending with 1912 and, second, for the year 1913, for individual cities, with the increase or decrease in the rate during the year compared with the average for the previous decade:

TABLE II.—Comparative homicide rates, 30 American cities, 1903-1913.

Cities.	1903-1912.		1913.		Increase or decrease in the rate.
	Homicides.	Rate per 100,000 of population.	Homicides.	Rate per 100,000 of population.	
Memphis, Tenn.....	723	58.3	95	68.0	+ 9.7
Charleston, S. C.....	178	30.6	18	30.1	— .5
Savannah, Ga.....	169	27.1	33	48.3	+21.2
New Orleans, La.....	800	24.5	88	24.8	+ .3
Atlanta, Ga.....	320	23.1	58	33.3	+10.2
Nashville, Tenn.....	210	20.4	47	39.4	+19.0
Louisville, Ky.....	360	16.4	35	15.2	— 1.2
St. Louis, Mo.....	851	12.9	92	12.8	— .1
San Francisco, Cal.....	366	11.4	59	13.4	+ 2.0
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	380	10.7	44	11.7	+ 1.0
Chicago, Ill.....	1,881	9.1	216	9.3	+ .2
Seattle, Wash.....	161	8.1	18	6.3	— 1.8
Washington, D. C.....	240	7.5	23	6.6	— .9
Spokane, Wash.....	63	7.2	14	11.2	+ 4.0
Cleveland, Ohio.....	305	5.9	40	6.5	+ .6
Manhattan and Bronx, N. Y.....	1,473	5.7	211	7.1	+ 1.4
Providence, R. I.....	109	5.2	9	3.8	— 1.4
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	264	5.1	37	6.6	+ 1.5
Dayton, Ohio.....	53	4.9	11	8.7	+ 3.8
Boston, Mass.....	292	4.6	36	5.0	+ .4
Brooklyn, N. Y.....	661	4.4	86	4.8	+ .4
Baltimore, Md.....	226	4.1	40	7.0	+ 2.9
Philadelphia, Pa.....	598	4.0	86	5.3	+ 1.3
Reading, Pa.....	34	3.7	1	1.0	— 2.7
Buffalo, N. Y.....	150	3.7	22	4.9	+ 1.2
Hartford, Conn.....	31	3.6	2	1.9	— 1.7
Minneapolis, Minn.....	93	3.3	16	4.9	+ 1.6
Rochester, N. Y.....	60	3.0	9	3.7	+ .7
Newark, N. J.....	84	2.6	17	4.4	+ 1.8
Milwaukee, Wis.....	74	2.2	14	3.4	+ 1.2
Average.....	11,209	7.5	1,477	8.7	+ 1.2

This table is of exceptional interest and practical value. The comparison brings out a startling contrast between the homicide rates of the southern cities and those of the North and West. The city of Memphis ranks highest in the homicide rate of American cities, and this unenviable position is not only maintained for year 1913, but, in fact, the rate shows an increase of 9.7 per 100,000 of population. The 7 cities with homicide death rates in excess of 15 per 100,000 of population are all southern cities with a large negro population. Of these 7 cities, 5 showed a more or less considerable increase in the rate for 1913 in comparison with the average rate for the previous decade. Of the 30 cities under review, all but 8 show an increase in the rate for 1913. It would no doubt be of interest to know the true homicide rate according to race for southern cities; but such an analysis, however, would not be necessary at this time, since the problem of homicide is fundamentally one of law and order and not of race. It would be much more interesting to know the true homicide rate of southern rural territory. Unfortunately, however, there are no trustworthy southern vital statistics other than for large cities; but a beginning has been made in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, and Mississippi, and within a few years trustworthy and conclusive information should be available.

The limited development of hospital facilities outside of the large cities of the South tends to concentrate the victims of homicide in the large centers of population, and this in part explains the excessive rates for Memphis, New Orleans, etc. These cities draw a considerable portion of their hospital patients from the surrounding territory, but the fact remains that the rates are conclusive evidence of a local disregard for human life which imperatively demands the attention of the authorities and of the public at large.

Comparing the average homicide mortality rate of our large cities for the decade ending with 1912 with the rate for the year 1913, there was an increase in the rate of 1.2 per 100,000 of population; compared with the previous year, there was an increase in the rate of 0.4. The evidence is therefore quite conclusive that the present tendency of the homicide rate is distinctly in the wrong direction.

The table following exhibits the comparative rates of eastern, southern, central, and western cities:

TABLE III.—Comparative mortality from homicide, by geographical distribution, 1903–1913.

Cities.	1903–1912.			1913.			Increase in the rate.
	Number of cities.	Homicides.	Rate per 100,000.	Number of cities.	Homicides.	Rate per 100,000.	
Eastern.....	11	3,756	4.7	11	516	5.6	+0.9
Central.....	7	3,637	8.4	7	433	8.8	+ .4
Southern.....	9	3,226	17.0	9	437	21.2	+4.2
Western.....	3	590	9.7	3	91	10.7	+1.0
All cities.....	30	11,209	7.5	30	1,477	8.7	+1.2

According to this comparison, the homicide rate during the year 1913 was highest in the southern cities, or 21.2 per 100,000 of population, followed by western cities, with a rate of 10.7; by central cities, with a rate of 8.8; and by eastern cities, with a rate of 5.6. The relative increase in the rate of 1913, compared with the previous decade, was highest in southern cities, or 4.2 per 100,000 of population, and lowest in the cities of the Central West, or 0.4.

Homicide occurs chiefly at ages 15 to 44. The table below will show the mortality rate by sex and age for the United States registration area for the decade ending with 1912:

Mortality from homicide, by age and sex, United States registration area, 1903–1912.

Ages.	Males.		Females.	
	Number.	Rate per 100,000 population.	Number.	Rate per 100,000 population.
Under 5.....	668	2.8	602	2.6
5–14.....	367	.9	220	.5
15–44.....	14,963	12.6	3,812	3.4
45 and over.....	3,463	7.3	692	1.5

The rates at ages under 5 represent chiefly cases of infanticide. The rates at this period of life are practically the same for both sexes. At the age period of most importance, from a life-insurance point of view—that is, 15 to 44—the male rate is 12.6 against a female rate of 3.4 per 100,000 of population.

The age distribution of mortality from homicide in more detail is given in the table below. Of the deaths at ages under 5, about 80 per cent occurred during the first year of life.

Mortality from homicide, by age and sex, United States registration area, 1908–1912.

Ages.	Males.		Females.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Under 5 ¹	486	3.7	429	12.0
5–19.....	952	7.2	523	14.7
20–29.....	4,453	33.8	1,165	32.6
30–39.....	3,704	28.1	759	21.3
40–49.....	2,095	15.9	400	11.2
50–59.....	957	7.3	179	5.0
60–69.....	388	2.9	60	1.7
70–79.....	125	.9	44	1.2
80 and over.....	31	.2	11	.3
Total known ages.....	13,191	100.0	3,570	100.0
Unknown ages.....	128		19	

¹ Of the males under 5 years of age, 389, or 80 per cent, occurred during the first year of life, and of the females, 335, or 78.1 per cent.

The table is self-explanatory and requires no discussion.

It is only for the last three years that the homicide returns of the Census Office have been published according to the method employed. The details of the analysis for the three years ending with 1912 are given in the table below:

Mortality from homicide by method employed, 1910–1912, according to sex.

Method employed.	Males.		Females.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
By firearms.....	5,446	62.1	1,202	52.8
By cutting or piercing instruments.....	1,400	15.9	282	12.4
By other means.....	1,929	22.0	792	34.8
Total.....	8,775	100.0	2,276	100.0

As shown by this analysis of deaths from homicide, of males, 62.1 per cent were caused by firearms. The corresponding proportion for females was 52.8 per cent. It is a matter of regret that the information should not be available to show the proportion of deaths from homicide caused by poisoning. The problem of murder in its final analysis is to a considerable extent a question of the effective regulation of the sale and possession of dangerous weapons and dangerous drugs. The analysis of the American statistics for the three years ending with 1912 suggests the direction in which it may be quite possible to achieve far-reaching reforms.

There is urgency for an international classification of crimes in conformity to the principles of standardizing statistical methods which underlie the international classification of causes of death. There is, furthermore, an urgent need for a Government inquiry into the occurrence of homicide on the basis of our judicial records in much the same manner as was done in the Government inquiry into the frequency of divorce. Whether it would be possible for the United States to develop a complete system of criminal statistics in conformity to the admirable judicial statistics for England and Wales and the German criminal statistics is an open question. It, however, would not seem difficult for the Government to obtain the required information regarding indictments, trials, and convictions for homicide, within a reasonably broad interpretation of the term.

Homicide statistics.

GREATER NEW YORK.

Year.	Population.	Homicides.	Rate per 100,000 population.
1907.....	4,367,976	285	6.5
1908.....	4,500,945	231	5.1
1909.....	4,633,914	182	3.9
1910.....	4,766,883	286	6.0
1911.....	4,899,852	281	5.7
1907–1911.....	23,169,570	1,265	5.5

LONDON.

Year.	Population.	Homicides.	Rate per 100,000 population.
1907.....	4,538,223	39	0.9
1908.....	4,530,892	52	1.1
1909.....	4,535,561	33	.7
1910.....	4,534,230	44	1.0
1911.....	4,532,899	44	1.0
1907–1911.....	22,677,805	212	.9

BERLIN.

Year.	Population.	Homicides.	Rate per 100,000 population.
1907.....	2,076,437	41	2.0
1908.....	2,057,274	47	2.3
1909.....	2,057,610	46	2.2
1910.....	2,071,907	39	1.9
1911.....	2,074,359	36	1.7
1907–1911.....	10,337,597	209	2.0

PARIS.

Year.	Population.	Homicides.	Rate per 100,000 population.
1910.....	2,822,135	103	3.6
1911.....	2,847,229	98	3.4
1910–11.....	5,669,364	201	3.5

The international aspects of the homicide problem are of interest and importance. Nothing emphasizes better the deplorable condition in this country than the fact that, for illustration, the homicide mortality rate of Greater New York should be six times the rate for London. The tables immediately above for Greater New York, London, Berlin, and Paris are included to facilitate the study of the problem. Of course, all international statistics of this kind are open to the criticism that the facts may not be strictly comparable. There is, however, a lesser liability to error in mortality statistics than in judicial statistics, which, as previously pointed out, are not available for the United States as a whole.

Homicide, in the experience of life insurance companies, is of considerably less importance than suicide or accidents. In the aggregate there are over 16,000 suicides per annum in the United States and over 80,000 accidents. Deaths due to homicide were not separately returned in the statistical tables of the medico-actuarial investigation, largely, no doubt, because murder cases are relatively rare in life insurance experience. The subject, however, is one of unusual interest, and as a broad public question is one of considerable practical importance, well deserving of more extended and qualified consideration.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, December 15, 1914.

Hon. JOHN K. SHIELDS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am inclosing herewith a table showing the number of homicides in the registration area during each year of the period 1900 to 1913. The total number of deaths charged to homicide is shown for each State of the area and for each city which had a population of 100,000 or over in 1910.

In this connection I desire to call your attention to the fact that the increase during the later years is probably more apparent than real. Unfortunately, the original returns of violent deaths are defective in many instances, so that classification is difficult with respect to the number of deaths from homicide, suicide, and accident. Beginning with the year 1905, this bureau began to make a very determined effort to secure explicit statements of violent deaths. It should be remembered that a death is never compiled under the heading of homicide

unless an explicit statement of that fact is given in the return. In the earlier years of this period such returns as "pistol-shot wound," "knife wound," "fracture of the skull," etc., were compiled as accidental if returned without qualification. Since 1905, however, such reports have been returned to the sources from which they came, with the request for information as to whether death was due to accident, suicide, or homicide. More explicit descriptions secured in this way account very largely for the increase indicated in the later years of this period.

The whole subject of reporting and classifying deaths from violence was once in a very unsatisfactory state, but through the earnest efforts of registration officials, the medical profession, and the coroners in co-operating with the Bureau of the Census, positive assurance can be given that returns of homicide, together with other definite and specific classes, are not at the present time vitiated by the inclusion of uncertain causes to any appreciable extent.

Very truly, yours,

W. L. AUSTIN, Director.

Area.	Number of homicides in the registration area in the year—													
	1913	1912	1911	1910	1909	1908	1907	1906	1905	1904	1903	1902	1901	1900
The registration area ¹	4,567	3,954	3,907	3,190	2,854	3,003	2,709	2,101	1,540	935	834	734	709	658
Registration States ²	3,607	3,011	3,039	2,185	1,857	1,858	1,701	1,310	463	283	236	255	233	230
California.....	317	350	253	261	230	253	225	159	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Colorado.....	101	82	106	94	87	126	102	88	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Connecticut.....	47	41	43	27	39	39	24	19	15	2	7	3	2	(³)
Indiana.....	155	133	124	120	114	124	121	99	85	34	31	24	24	37
Kentucky.....	322	248	315	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Maine.....	22	16	18	13	8	9	13	3	16	3	9	2	11	10
Maryland.....	84	51	52	41	47	49	61	43	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Massachusetts.....	108	106	101	90	81	79	69	46	38	36	33	33	33	23
Michigan.....	120	82	70	71	60	78	59	30	16	25	33	32	36	17
Minnesota.....	66	60	82	68	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Missouri.....	331	259	305	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Montana.....	44	59	51	37	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
New Hampshire.....	14	6	7	4	6	3	5	9	3	2	(³)	(³)	1	1
New Jersey.....	118	113	98	111	100	97	89	61	35	24	10	23	11	19
New York.....	494	480	500	452	369	419	453	337	211	131	86	113	102	102
North Carolina ⁴	86	73	61	24	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Ohio.....	296	279	265	212	227	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Pennsylvania.....	432	352	347	362	331	365	406	365	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Rhode Island.....	19	15	20	22	15	21	24	18	9	14	10	14	9	11
Utah.....	34	29	27	21	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Vermont.....	9	4	19	7	13	9	6	3	7	2	1	1	1	(³)
Virginia.....	231	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Washington.....	79	86	88	81	62	86	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Wisconsin.....	54	64	56	39	41	48	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
District of Columbia.....	24	23	31	28	14	32	31	20	28	10	16	10	3	10
Registration cities in nonregistration States.....	960	943	868	1,005	597	1,145	1,008	791	1,077	652	598	479	476	428
Cities of 100,000 population or over in 1910:														
Birmingham, Ala.....	135	83	93	104	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Los Angeles, Cal.....	54	45	34	47	20	23	27	21	10	7	6	13	9	10
Oakland, Cal.....	12	12	10	11	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
San Francisco, Cal.....	66	59	48	50	51	44	63	42	37	41	43	27	43	16
Denver, Colo.....	13	17	24	23	20	36	15	19	17	18	17	9	11	1
Bridgeport, Conn.....	5	2	5	4	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
New Haven, Conn.....	11	8	6	5	2	8	3	3	2	(³)	(³)	1	1	(³)
Atlanta, Ga.....	58	67	48	42	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Chicago, Ill.....	223	219	203	201	227	207	205	165	186	129	137	109	96	114
Indianapolis, Ind.....	37	19	20	29	22	16	18	13	10	5	5	7	(³)	(³)
Louisville, Ky.....	41	34	47	35	32	41	50	45	40	29	31	9	14	12
New Orleans, La.....	88	100	85	77	80	114	87	94	73	42	47	39	30	6
Baltimore, Md.....	42	24	28	18	18	18	42	27	21	9	10	10	13	15
Boston, Mass.....	37	33	33	41	28	26	41	27	18	23	15	25	20	11
Cambridge, Mass.....	4	(³)	2	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Fall River, Mass.....	(³)	2	3	1	2	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Lowell, Mass.....	(³)	1	2	5	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Worcester, Mass.....	7	6	4	3	2	3	4	2	3	3	1	1	(³)	1
Detroit, Mich.....	48	30	17	23	11	21	14	7	3	4	5	7	4	1
Grand Rapids, Mich.....	7	5	2	3	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Minneapolis, Minn.....	16	14	11	12	11	5	13	15	13	2	3	1	2	3
St. Paul, Minn.....	8	6	7	9	7	6	5	1	6	6	5	2	9	(³)
Kansas City, Mo.....	74	58	62	50	40	54	42	15	28	31	19	7	2	5
St. Louis, Mo.....	94	97	109	77	71	73	97	71	84	108	68	75	68	98
Omaha, Neb.....	12	10	14	6	15	11	10	5	4	3	2	1	(³)	(³)
Jersey City, N. J.....	11	2	9	14	9	14	12	6	4	8	1	3	2	3
Newark, N. J.....	18	21	12	15	18	8	12	9	4	4	2	7	7	6
Paterson, N. J.....	10	6	5	10	5	1	3	6	1	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	4
Albany, N. Y.....	1	11	7	3	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Buffalo, N. Y.....	20	18	25	17	22	22	31	22	8	(³)	(³)	5	1	1
New York, N. Y.....	340	312	306	209	204	259	292	245	175	109	71	93	83	91
Rochester, N. Y.....	8	8	15	8	5	5	14	3	(³)	2	1	4	(³)	2
Syracuse, N. Y.....	5	2	3	5	3	3	1	2	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	44	42	57	30	42	46	38	43	27	26	31	21	24	15
Cleveland, Ohio.....	44	37	50	36	37	47	29	18	24	13	17	9	7	11
Columbus, Ohio.....	15	27	13	25	11	20	21	4	4	8	3	1	3	(³)
Dayton, Ohio.....	11	6	8	4	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Toledo, Ohio.....	26	11	12	13	3	9	6	4	7	3	2	4	2	(³)
Portland, Oreg.....	21	15	11	24	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Philadelphia, Pa.....	91	64	66	86	73	75	84	76	34	39	31	25	31	18
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	43	31	29	34	21	26	32	43	21	17	22	23	16	13
Scranton, Pa.....	9	9	5	8	9	7	7	5	6	(³)	1	2	2	(³)
Providence, R. I.....	14	6	16	14	8	12	19	12	6	9	6	8	8	7
Memphis, Tenn.....	95	88	85	112	104	93	77	78	68	8	10	3	3	4
Nashville, Tenn.....	48	41	40	23	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Richmond, Va.....	27	33	27	27	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Seattle, Wash.....	19	29	20	33	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Spokane, Wash.....	10	7	10	8	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Milwaukee, Wis.....	14	16	11	9	5	14	3	6	9	3	4	5	3	3

¹ As constituted in each year.

² Includes District of Columbia.

³ Includes South Dakota, which was a registration State from 1905 to 1909; the State returned 10 homicides in 1906; 13 in 1907; 21 in 1908; and 13 in 1909.

⁴ Not admitted to registration area until a later date.

⁵ Includes only municipalities having a population of 1,000 or over in 1903.

⁶ Less than 100,000 population.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. NORRIS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 to begin the construction of two public bath-houses and the work of converting portions of the tidal basin in Potomac Park into public bathing beaches, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 21318), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted an amendment providing that any lieutenant colonel of the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, being one of the permanent officers thereof, who shall have served more than 6 years in that grade and more than 35 years continuously as a commissioned officer in the United States Army, the President is authorized to promote such officer to the next higher grade, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20347), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WEEKS submitted an amendment providing that so much of the act of Congress approved July 10, 1912, be amended so as to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out existing contracts entered into under date of December 21, 1907, between the Secretary of the Treasury and Peabody & Stearns, architects, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 21318), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment authorizing the President to transfer to the active list of the Navy any officer retired on July 1, 1914, under the personnel act of 1899 as modified by the act approved August 22, 1912, who is now performing active duty, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 20975), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment providing for a refund of sums paid for documentary stamps, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 21546), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted an amendment providing that no money appropriated for pay in the Navy or for the pay of retired officers of the Navy shall be used for the pay of any dental surgeons or for the pay of any retired dental surgeons in the United States Navy, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 20975), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for incidental and contingent expenses, including rent of building, at the assay office at Seattle, Wash., from \$5,000 to \$6,000, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 19909), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for wages of workmen and other employees at the assay office, Seattle, Wash., from \$15,000 to \$17,000, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 19909), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HUGHES submitted an amendment providing that hereafter assistant appraisers of merchandise shall receive a compensation, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed the sum of \$4,000 per annum, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 21318), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. STONE submitted an amendment authorizing A. T. Bin Town Chu, a Chinese merchant, resident of the city of New York, to conduct a party of not exceeding 500 Chinese residents of the United States to China, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill (H. R. 21201), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PITTMAN submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Truckee-Carson project, Nevada, from \$236,000 to \$238,000, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 21318), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUBTREASURY AT ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. STONE. I submit an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for the commencement of the construction of a subtreasury building at St. Louis, Mo., intended to be proposed by me to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 21318), which I ask may be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I know the sundry civil bill has been reported and is now on the calendar, but notwithstanding that fact, I ask

that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That course will be taken.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BURTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE SENATE RULES.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 551), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President, and that the Vice President be the chairman, to take into consideration the rules for conducting business in the Senate of the United States, and report to the Senate such alterations and amendments, if any, as they shall judge proper; and may employ such assistance as may be required, and the necessary actual expense incurred in the execution of this order shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The said committee is hereby authorized to sit during the session or recess of the Senate at Washington or elsewhere.

THE SMELTING INDUSTRY.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 550), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate his findings and conclusions in the investigation conducted by the Department of Justice in the matter of illegal combinations in restraint of trade in the smelting industry, commonly called the Smelting Trust.

THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 552), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to appoint a subcommittee thereof to consider in the interval between the Sixty-third Congress and the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress, or during a session or recess of the Sixty-fourth Congress, the proposed codification, revision, and amendment of the laws relating to the judiciary contemplated in the bill H. R. 15578, passed by the House of Representatives in the last preceding session, and that such subcommittee be authorized to employ and compensate such persons as may be found necessary to assist in any work arising in connection with such consideration, the expenses thereby incurred to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the subcommittee.

THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispose of a matter of very great public importance, which is heartily urged by the Commerce Department. I refer to the bill (H. R. 19746) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes. The bill has passed the House and been sent to the Senate. It was unanimously favored by the Committee on Commerce and recommended by the Department of Commerce. It can be disposed of in a few moments.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, so long as this is a House bill I do not think we ought to consider it this morning. If it were a Senate bill, and had to go to the other House as an emergency measure, I would not object to its consideration. I will say to the Senator from Florida that I have not any doubt that the calendar will be taken up in regular order, and that all bills to which there is no objection will be passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA.

Mr. SHIELDS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 6854) to incorporate the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that is a Senate bill, and I think it perhaps might as well be passed now as at any other time.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Let the bill be read, Mr. President.

Mr. ROOT. I have no objection to the consideration of the bill, but I think we ought to really consider it—that is, to really consider what kind of a corporation the Government of the United States ought to authorize for this purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the bill be read for information, Mr. President.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The bill is evidently going to lead to debate, and I think it would be unfortunate to take up a bill on the calendar which is going to lead to extended debate. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not press the motion at this time.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, if the bill shall lead to extended debate, I shall not insist upon its consideration at this time; but I think the Senator from New York [Mr. Root]

understands this matter fully and the precedents that we have for it, and that he will not interpose debate on the subject.

This is a bill similar to one enacted some years ago incorporating the American Red Cross. Its objects are of a similar character; they are benevolent and charitable and for the purpose of training the youth of the country. It has the very highest merit; it is national in its character, in its objects, and in its purposes.

There is no question in my mind that Congress has the power to incorporate such a society. There are provisions in the Code of the District of Columbia for the incorporation of religious, charitable, and benevolent societies, and numbers of others of a nature similar. The reason for asking a special act in this case is that those provisions do not give all the privileges and extend all the protection to this association that are necessary for the accomplishment of its purposes, just as in the case of the Red Cross.

I will briefly mention one of them: The charter of the American Red Cross protects its insignia and emblems of various kinds from imitation by anyone. That is one of the objects of this bill. There are people who are imitating the insignia, the emblems, and the buttons that are ordinarily used by this society. Those people have even gone so far as to use the words as brands for cigarettes to be sold to boys. They are branding various articles for sale with the name "Boy Scouts" and with their insignia. The object of this charter is to protect the association from such use and invasion of their insignia and emblems.

Behind this movement are benevolent men from all over the United States. This bill contains the names of prominent men from almost every State in the Union who are greatly interested in the movement and believe this charter necessary to carry on the great work they have in hand. For these reasons I hope that there will be no objection and that the bill will be allowed to pass.

I will further state that it has been favorably considered by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House and that the parliamentary situation in the House is such that, if this bill is passed, it can be immediately substituted for the House bill and be enacted into law at this session of Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, let the bill be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, it is perfectly manifest that this bill is going to be debated. The Senator from Tennessee, who thought there would be no debate, proceeded to make an argument himself upon it. I dislike to object, but I see no more reason for going to the calendar and taking up this bill and considering it than many other bills, and so I am compelled to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3897) to authorize the Great Northern Railway Co. to revise the location of its right of way, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 6, after "location," to insert "within three years from the passage of this act," and on page 3, line 7, after "forests," to insert: "Provided further, That before the Secretary of the Interior shall consent to and approve the revision of location herein authorized, the Great Northern Railway Co. shall file with the said Secretary a relinquishment of all claims of whatever nature to that portion of its right of way affected by said revised location."

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask that the bill be read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That, with the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Interior and upon the filing with the Interior Department and the approval thereof by said Secretary of maps of definite location, the Great Northern Railway Co., a corporation of the State of Minnesota, be, and it is hereby, authorized to revise the location of that part of its line of railway along the southern boundary of the Glacier National Park, in the State of Montana, on the terms and conditions and subject to the limitations and restrictions granted by and contained in an act of Congress entitled "An act granting to railroads the right of way through the public lands of the United States," approved March 3, 1875 (18 Stats., p. 482), as amended by an act of Congress entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, and for prior years, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stats., p. 1233): *Provided*, That all lands north of the north line of the revised right of way, when said revised line of right of way shall have been approved as aforesaid, shall be excluded from the Lewis and Clark National Forest and become and remain part of the Glacier National Park, and be subject to all the provisions of an act of Congress entitled "An act to establish 'the Glacier National Park' in the Rocky Mountains south*

of the international boundary line in the State of Montana, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 354), and to all the provisions of any act of Congress that may hereafter be passed relative to said park, and the regulations of the Secretary of the Interior heretofore or hereafter prescribed in accordance with law for the government of the park, and that any and all lands south of the north line of such revised line of right of way which may now be within the Glacier National Park shall become and remain a part of the Lewis and Clark National Forest and be subject to and be governed by the laws heretofore or hereafter enacted by Congress and the regulations heretofore or hereafter prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture for the control of national forests.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana what are the amendments of the House and what the effect is upon the bill as it passed the Senate?

Mr. MYERS. The House amendments provide that when the Great Northern Railway surrenders its old right of way, making some minor changes abutting on the Glacier National Park, wholly in the State of Montana, the old right of way shall revert to the United States Government.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all the amendments provide?

Mr. MYERS. That is all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments of the House.

The amendments were concurred in.

SURVEY OF OYSTER BEDS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3362) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, through the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries, to make a survey of natural oyster beds, bars and rocks, and barren bottoms contiguous thereto in waters along the coast of and within the State of Texas, which were, on page 2, line 2, after "publications," to insert "at a total limit of cost of \$10,000"; and, on page 2, to strike out lines 6 to 13, inclusive.

Mr. SHEPPARD and Mr. CULBERSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask that the resolution which went over yesterday on the objection of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] be now laid before the Senate. It is Senate resolution 549, relating to an amendment to the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The resolution (S. Res. 549) introduced by Mr. NORRIS on the 18th instant, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the standing rules of the Senate be amended by adding a new rule, as follows:

"Rule XLI. It shall be in order during the morning hour to make a motion that any bill or resolution then on the calendar shall be considered under the terms of this rule. Such motion, when made, shall lie over one day and shall then be decided without debate. No Senator shall be allowed to vote on a motion to consider a bill or resolution under this rule who is bound by any caucus or conference of Senators to vote in any particular way on said bill or resolution, or any amendment thereto, but when any Senator's right to vote upon such motion is challenged, such Senator shall be allowed to determine for himself whether he is disqualified from voting on said motion. When it has been decided to consider a bill or resolution under this rule, the same shall first be considered in general debate, during which time no Senator, except by unanimous consent, shall be allowed to speak more than three hours. At the close of general debate the bill or resolution shall be read for amendments, and on any amendment that may be offered no Senator, except by unanimous consent, shall speak for more than 15 minutes: *Provided*, That any Senator who has not spoken for three hours in general debate shall, in addition to said 15 minutes, be allowed additional time, but in no case shall such additional time or times, including the time used by such Senator in general debate, exceed in the aggregate three hours: *Provided further*, That if unanimous consent for additional time is asked in behalf of any Senator, either during general debate or when the bill or resolution is being considered for amendment, and the same is refused, it shall be in order by motion to extend the time of such Senator for a time to be named in said motion, which motion shall be decided without debate. When the bill or resolution is being read for amendment all debate shall be confined to the amendment which is then pending."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have no desire to take up the time of the Senate in a discussion of this proposed rule; but all the propositions involved in it have been debated for several days, and there is not any doubt but that every Senator knows whether he is in favor of it or against it. It seems to me that it is no more than fair, after all the debate that has taken place, that we should reach a vote.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules. This resolution practically has been before the Committee on Rules, and the committee decided not to report it back adversely, but that it was not the time now

to take up this question. Therefore I think it ought to go to the Committee on Rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on referring the resolution to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on that question I desire to say just a few words. I do not know but that it may as well be settled in that way, or by a motion to lay the resolution on the table, because everybody knows that if it goes to the Committee on Rules it goes there to stay.

As the Senator has said, a resolution introduced by me involving all the propositions in this rule, with the exception of the one relating to the caucus, has not been reported. The facts are, as I understand them, that a motion to report that resolution out of the committee favorably was defeated, and then those who favored the resolution in order to get it out of committee and on the calendar made a motion to report it out adversely, and that was defeated. That shows that the Committee on Rules will neither report one way nor report the other way. If this were a new proposition, if it had not been discussed, and if most of the questions had not been for several days the unfinished business before the Senate, it seems to me that a reference to the Committee on Rules would be proper.

The proposed rule involves two propositions. It has two objects. One is to prevent a filibuster and the other is to prevent caucusing upon bills that are reported to the Senate. Those who are opposed to filibustering and who are opposed to caucusing ought to be in favor of a proposition of this kind. I realize that there are those who are in favor of retaining the right to filibuster and who are opposed to a caucus. If those Senators think more of the filibuster than they hate the caucus, of course they would be against it. There are others who are opposed to a filibuster and who are in favor of the caucus. If they love the caucus more than they hate the filibuster, they would be against it. There are other Senators who are opposed both to the caucus and to the filibuster, and I take it that they would favor some resolution of this kind. But it is subject to amendment. If some Senator wants to strike out the part which refers to the caucus, we can get a vote on it, unless it is debated until after 2 o'clock, and I am perfectly willing to have a vote on any of these propositions; but it does seem to me that after all this debate and all the consideration that has been given to this question we are entitled to a vote upon the merits of the propositions involved.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. As I said a day or two ago, I am in favor of a rule which limits debate in the Senate, and I think the allowance for debate provided for in this resolution is sufficient; but, as I remarked then and as I feel now, I will not vote for any cloture or any limitation upon debate upon a bill, resolution, or question of any kind which has been made the subject of a caucus. I endeavored so to qualify the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska when it was before us as an amendment to the resolution of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]; but I was not able to accomplish my object in that way, and we are now compelled to examine it in another form.

The Senator from Nebraska, in this resolution, proposes to reach that object by disqualifying every Senator who is bound by a caucus or conference order. I would vote for that if it were not for one thing. I do not believe it is within the constitutional power of the Senate to disqualify a Senator from voting upon a bill or resolution of that kind because he has been a member of a caucus and has thereby become bound, or may feel bound, to vote in a particular way.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to call the attention of the Senator first to the fact that this is not a disqualification to vote on a bill or a resolution; and then I want to ask him another question. If it is unconstitutional to prohibit a Senator, under the conditions named, from voting to put a rule in operation, would it not also be unconstitutional to prohibit a Senator from making the motion; and is not that what the Senator's proposition involves?

Mr. CUMMINS. No.

Mr. NORRIS. He provides, in what he wants to do to get at the caucus, that no member of the party in which a caucus is held shall have the right to make a motion. Now, if it is unconstitutional to disqualify a man from voting, it certainly ought to be unconstitutional to disqualify a Senator from making the motion itself.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, while I do not think the instances are parallel, yet, in anticipation of the objection that has just been made by the Senator from Nebraska—

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator that I am basing that suggestion on the Senator's argument. I do not think there is any constitutional question involved.

Mr. CUMMINS. In anticipation of that objection I had prepared the amendment which I offered in a little different form, and had stricken out the provision to which the Senator from Nebraska referred, so that it would read in this way:

This rule shall not apply to any bill, motion, resolution, or question upon which Senators belonging to any political party have held a caucus and passed a resolution, or declaration in any form, attempting to bind the members of such party in the Senate to vote in any particular way.

My view of it would limit the application of the rule to those cases in which the majority party had not held a caucus and attempted to bind the members of their organization to vote in a particular way, and could not be subject to any possible constitutional objection. But mark, now, the language of the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska:

It shall be in order during the morning hour to make a motion that any bill or resolution then on the calendar shall be considered under the terms of this rule. Such motion when made shall lie over one day and shall then be decided without debate. No Senator shall be allowed to vote on a motion to consider a bill or resolution under this rule who is bound by any caucus or conference of Senators to vote in any particular way on said bill or resolution or any amendment thereto.

If I said a few moments ago that the rule would disqualify a Senator from voting upon a bill or resolution, I was unhappy in my use of words. What the rule attempts to do is to disqualify a Senator from voting upon the motion to apply the rule limiting debate.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator did not read all of his rule, and I wish to ask him now if his rule does not disqualify a Senator from making a motion?

Mr. CUMMINS. It does not, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator read the balance of his rule, which he has not yet read?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator refers to the second paragraph?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. (reading)—

The fact respecting the existence of such caucus, resolution, or declaration shall be determined in the first instance by a committee of five Senators appointed by the presiding officer, who shall report within two days, and upon its report by the Senate without debate.

There is no disqualification at all in the rule that I have proposed. It simply renders the rule inapplicable to the instance concerning which a caucus has been held.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is within the power of the Senate to disqualify a Senator from voting upon any question that comes before the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Is not this language in the Senator's proposition? I have it printed here in my hand:

And where the application of the rule is moved by a Senator belonging to any such political party.

Mr. CUMMINS. No.

Mr. NORRIS. Has the Senator stricken that out?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Even though it were not stricken out, there would be no disqualification in it. The whole purpose of my amendment is to determine certain cases in which the rule can not apply.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that. Now, I want to ask the Senator if he does not distinguish, on the constitutional question he is raising, between these two propositions—the disqualification of a Senator from voting on a resolution or on a bill and the disqualification of a Senator who by his own conduct has placed himself in a position where he can not vote upon a motion that makes the rule applicable? That is not voting on a bill or resolution.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am unable to see any difference between the two instances; that is, the right to vote upon a bill and the right to vote upon a motion. A Senator comes here for the purpose of discharging his full duty. He enters the Senate with the right to vote upon every question that may come before the Senate and that may affect finally the deliberation or the action of the Senate. The fact that a Senator has entered into a caucus can no more disqualify him from voting in the Senate than though it were provided that if he had expressed his opinion with regard to the particular matter in hand therefore he should be disqualified.

I regret very much that this difference of opinion between the Senator from Nebraska and myself respecting the way in which to guard against the action of a caucus has so far separated us that he can not vote for my proposition and I can not vote for his, although I believe that we are united in the judgment that there ought to be a limitation upon the right of debate in the Senate.

For the reasons that I have given I intend to vote to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules, for there I shall hope to attach to it the amendment I have proposed instead of the provision which has been adopted by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Why does not the Senator offer his amendment to insert these words here, and let us have a vote on that and have the matter determined, rather than to send it to the committee, where it will be dead?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. I move to lay the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida to lay the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska on the table.

Mr. NORRIS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the request seconded?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. While I am not in harmony with the Senator from Nebraska as to the exact rule proposed here, it seems to me that the pending question is the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules, and that a motion to lay the original resolution upon the table is not in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to lay the resolution on the table takes precedence of the other motion.

Mr. OVERMAN. Inasmuch as we can not act upon this matter in the Committee on Rules at the present session, I withdraw my motion and will let the motion to table take precedence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has precedence.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Florida withhold his motion just one moment that I may make a request?

Mr. BRYAN. Very well.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have the Lexington (Ky.) Herald, which contains an editorial on the question of cloture discussed very fairly and forcibly. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Lexington Herald, Tuesday, Feb. 16, 1915.]

REMEMBER THE FORCE BILL.

One false step quickly leads to another, with the almost inevitable result that disaster overtakes those who stray from the path to the edge of the precipice. Those who advocate the passage of the shipping bill now urge the adoption by the Senate of a rule to limit debate, so that the question may be brought to a vote.

Immediately dangerous as would be the passage of the shipping bill, disastrous as it would be to the Democratic Party, it is not so dangerous as is a cloture rule for the Senate.

During the first century of this Government both the Senate and the House were deliberative bodies, in which great governmental questions were discussed and debated by great men. Appeals to reason and to patriotism were the basis for seeking the votes of Members of the House as well as of the Senate. Upon the speeches made in both bodies the judgment of the country was based. The great figures of the first century of the Government won their spurs and achieved their reputation in the House, and until the dark days when Tom Reed presided over its deliberations—or, rather, ruled over its proceedings—the House of Representatives was the greater body.

Due to the insatiable desire for temporary party advantage, the House was changed by Reed's rules from a deliberative legislative body to a body which merely records in votes the purposes of the majority of the party in control. No longer is the Speaker of the House of Representatives second in power and in dignity only to the President. He is now but a mere presiding officer, from whose hands has been taken the power to appoint committees, who has been stripped of the power of recognition, the greatest power a presiding officer can have, and the debates of the House have deteriorated, until they no longer command the respect or even attract the attention of the country.

* During the very period when the Republican Party, under the dominant leadership of Czar Reed, adopted the rules which destroyed the individuality of the House and changed it from a deliberative to a mere recording body, there was an episode in the Senate that should not be forgotten by southern men who to gain their point in the enactment of the shipping bill are willing to vote for cloture. The same intolerant spirit that led to the adoption of the Reed rules by the Republican majority in the House of Representatives led to the introduction of the force bill.

Under the Reed rules there was no doubt that the force bill, or any bill drafted by the leaders and desired by the most extreme element of the Republican Party, could be pushed through the House of Representatives. Due to the Reed rules, it was impossible even for so superb a minority as the Democratic membership of the House of Representatives at that time to prevent by argument or by filibuster the passage of any bill, no matter how vicious, indorsed by the leaders of the Republican Party.

The only salvation of the South from the enactment of the force bill rested with those Democratic Senators who, day after day, week after week, with watchless vigilance, check-mated every move of the Republican majority in the Senate. There is in the legislative annals of this country no more glorious nor more serviceable episode than the filibuster led by Gorman of Maryland, which finally resulted in the defeat of the force bill.

It was at that time proposed by the Republicans to adopt a cloture rule. The more violent earnestly favored it, as do now the more violent and less intelligent Democrats. But the saving patriotism of some of the Republicans, their realization that the deliberative character of the House had been destroyed, so the Senate remained the last rampart for those who fight for due consideration of any measure before the American Congress, magnifying the importance and increasing the dignity of that body, made them unwilling to violate the traditions of a century and reduce the Senate to a mere recording instrument of the wishes of the temporary majority.

Those Democratic Senators who remember that episode, the men from the South who owe to those Democratic Senators who filibustered with Gorman freedom from the force bill, that would have given to Federal judges and Federal soldiers the right to supervise every polling place, should be the last to denounce their colleagues who with equally strong conviction and equal courage now oppose the shipping bill.

Are the Democrats of this Senate going to adopt a cloture rule in violation of all the traditions of the Senate, destroying the power and the dignity of the Senate, because the Senators are equally divided in support of and in opposition to the shipping bill, and the Democrats, by reason of having the Vice President, who is not a Member of the Senate and not even permitted to vote except in case of tie, can pass this bill by a majority of one? Surely this can not be.

Are there no Democratic Senators who favor this bill but who recognize their obligation to uphold the dignity of the body of which they are Members? Are there none there who fully realize the danger of the course they are pursuing? During recent years there has been a constantly growing encroachment of the executive on the power of the legislative. Under our Government there is presumed to be absolute separation between the powers of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial departments.

President Roosevelt used his commanding personality and dynamic force to drive through Congress bills that did not meet the approval of the majority of the Members of Congress. President Wilson has followed President Roosevelt's example. All the power of patronage, all the force of personality, all the prestige of office, have been used by him to influence the legislative department of the Government. Whether one approves or disapproves this change, no one can escape realization of the danger that would come were there a strong, vigorous, ambitious, unscrupulous man President, with the power to command the leader of the House to apply the cloture rule and force to quick decision a measure that had the temporary approval of the party, and also to command equally prompt and inconsiderate action in the Senate.

Vicious as is the shipping bill, it is not so vicious nor so permanent a danger as is the adoption of cloture by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the motion of the Senator from Florida to lay the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska on the table the Senator from Nebraska has asked for the yeas and nays. Is there a second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida to lay the resolution on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 19909, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 19909) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first disposed of.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to state to the Senator from Virginia it has never seemed to me quite fair that we should run through the bill and take up the committee amendments first and then go back and go over the bill again for individual amendments. I have no objection to the balance of the request, and I do not propose to make an objection to that, but I ask the Senator why should we not take the bill up and act on all amendments as we go through and not go through with it twice?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It will speed the dispatch of business. Long experience in the Senate has shown that.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me that it delays it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am sure the Senator from Nebraska is mistaken about that. It injures nobody to get through with the committee amendments first, for the bill is then open to amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. This appears—

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator objects, that is the end of it.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to be technical about it. To the balance of the Senator's request I certainly would not object.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator's request. My attention was diverted.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The request was that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

Mr. LODGE. I am entirely in sympathy with that request; but there is no formal reading of the bill required at this stage. It is simply the right of a Senator to ask for it. The sensible way to deal with all appropriation bills is the way the Senator from Virginia has suggested.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The bill as passed by the House will not be formally read in the Senate unless desired. The first thing in order is to read the bill through from beginning to end, without any amendments being considered, if that is requested.

Mr. LODGE. Exactly. The bill is not to be read in that way unless—

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. To avoid discussion I am willing to do anything. If the Senator objects, that is the end of it.

Mr. LODGE. I do not object. On the contrary, I think the Senator's request is exactly right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill will be read for action on the committee amendments, and the committee amendments will be considered as they are reached in the reading of the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Legislative," subhead "Senate," on page 2, after line 3, to strike out:

That in lieu of all mileage each Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner shall be allowed his actual traveling expenses for himself and the dependent members of his family in coming from and returning to his home, at each session of Congress.

Mr. LODGE. That I understand is the mileage amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. LODGE. I did not hear the first page of the bill read. It may have escaped my notice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair heard it read.

Mr. LODGE. It was my fault that I did not hear it. I wanted to say a word about that, and just a word.

Of course I am in favor of the committee's action, but I trust there will be no compromise on that proposition. It seems to me if any system is bad it is the worst that is provided in the House arrangement. We know what would be this business of providing for necessary traveling expenses for the family and dependents. We should have a lot of petty questions brought up here everlastingly. In my judgment there is only one sensible way of dealing with this matter, and that is by abolishing mileage, abolishing the stationery allowance, and paying Senators and Representatives a sufficient salary to cover their expenses for traveling and for stationery. All the trouble is made by these arrangements in the nature of perquisites. But if we can not have that system the present system of fixed mileage is infinitely better than such a system as is proposed by the House. I am very glad the committee has stricken it out, and I hope the committee will not assent to it in conference under any circumstances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the committee will be agreed to, without objection.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I simply want an opportunity to vote on this matter, and I object to agreeing to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee. All in favor of the amendment—

Mr. KENYON. Just a minute, please.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. Every year now the House sends to the Senate a provision in this bill in relation to mileage. I do not know whether it is better than the present provision for mileage or not. I do know the present arrangement as to mileage raises a good deal of adverse criticism as to Congress. Now, the House, by adopting what is apparently on the face of it a fairer provision, puts up to the Senate the proposition of increasing the mileage both for the Senate and for the House. I think the House provision ought to be called. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that mileage ought to be abolished and all perquisites ought to be abolished and a salary paid that would be sufficient to cover the whole matter and relieve Congress from the adverse criticism this mileage question brings up if the present salary is not adequate. I am inclined to the belief that the present salary is sufficient.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment, Mr. President.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether any calculation has been made as

to what would be the expenditure under the House provision? Is it not likely that it would be more than the amount provided for in the bill?

Mr. KENYON. I do not know, Mr. President, but—

Mr. SHAFROTH. If Members and the dependent members of their families are to be brought to Washington, as it would provide, it seems to me it is likely to be more than the amount which the Senate committee has recommended.

Mr. KENYON. I do not believe the privilege will be abused. The argument was made here before this that some Members of Congress would travel in more luxury than other Members of Congress, but they would not do that more than once, because they would be responsible to their constituents therefor.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the committee will be agreed to. The appropriation proposed by the House is entirely inadequate. Even with the language the House placed in the bill a few of the Senators who are more prompt in demanding mileage might receive their mileage and others could not. As they have worded it, it would seem that a Senator would have to stand, hat in hand, before the Presiding Officer while he went through item by item what meals he had had on the way, and as to the Pullman whether he had had a drawing room or a lower berth or an upper. To pass it as the House has it places it beyond the power of the conferees. Of course, there is a deficit in the mileage. I hope the amendment of the Senate committee will be agreed to and let it go to conference and let it be arranged there.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I shall not be a Member of the Congress during which this mileage is to be paid, and I can speak with entire impartiality on this subject.

It seems to me that the allowances for mileage and stationery have become a part of the compensation of a Senator or Representative quite as much as the prescribed salary. The mileage is a recognition of the fact that the Member of the House or of the Senate must leave his home and come to the Capital. It is also clearly recognized that, unless located very remote from the Capital, he goes back and forth between his home and Washington.

In this connection I may say that the striking out of the mileage provision at the end of the long special session in 1913 was an injustice to the Members of the House and Senate. The fact that they did not return home at the close of the special session of 1913 and return at the beginning of the regular session but emphasizes the length of our stay here and the necessity of going back and forth during that time. There were very few in the Senate who remained here during all of the extra session of 1913.

For many years this has been the custom. I think, nevertheless, it would be better, as suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], to make some provision for an increased salary. There is always a certain amount of criticism in regard to the mileage and the stationery allowances. There are very few Members of the Senate who do not spend more for traveling back and forth as an incident to the service here than that which is allowed under the law. To cut out that provision and substitute merely traveling expenses going and returning would, it seems to me, be unjust. Nevertheless, to avoid the inequality due to distance and relieve the Senate and the House from this constant criticism, it would seem to me much better to provide that each Senator or Representative shall have a specified salary, increased somewhat by reason of traveling expenses and stationery expenses, than to pay whatever his traveling expenses may be.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Does not the Senator believe that that ought to be done in the regular way?

Mr. BURTON. I think so.

Mr. WARREN. And not on an appropriation bill. That is what they have always demanded in the House, and we have been ready and anxious to meet it. The appropriation bill is not the place to change it.

Mr. BURTON. There is one feature which I may remark incidentally—the very wide difference between the mileage of Representatives and Senators who are near at hand and those who are far away. The mileage to a Member of the House living in Baltimore would be trivial, while that of a Senator or Member from Arizona or the State of Washington would be very considerable. It has come to be recognized, however, I think, as a part of the system, that the hardship of a Member located a considerable distance from the Capital is greater than that of one near at hand. There is plausibility, at least, in the argument or claim that their mileage should be very much greater. The traveling expenses may not be so much larger,

because they do not go back and forth between home and the Capital so frequently, but they are farther away from their homes, and in a sense are entitled to larger compensation. I think there should be a readjustment of the salaries, and the question of locality might very naturally be taken into account.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me ask the Senator one question in reference to the difference in the mileage of a man living in Baltimore and a man living in San Francisco. I think the Senator will acknowledge the fact that every man who is here at all has some business in his own State. He ought to have some business there which requires his attendance at least twice a year. He has to go back, for his business will not take care of itself ordinarily unless he does. Therefore, in order even to look after that business, with these almost continuous sessions of Congress, a Senator coming from San Francisco would have to make the trip at least twice a year to look after his business there. Then he would have to pay several thousand dollars out of his own pocket, while a Senator residing over in Baltimore would not pay that many cents out of his pocket. So the thing equalizes itself after all. If we assume, first, that a man must bring his family here and in addition to that he must return to his own State once or twice during the year, the mileage now fixed by law will just about equalize the difference between the Senator living close by and one living on the western coast.

Mr. BURTON. Not only does the Member or Senator have business or personal affairs to attend to, but it is very desirable that he should keep in touch with his constituents. The original idea of mileage was to provide traveling expenses coming to Washington and returning. That was when the means of communication were crude and very different from what they are now. I think the present idea is altogether different and is a recognition of the fact that he must spend a part of his time here in Washington and a part at home and must make trips more or less frequently between the two places.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the matter of compensation is to be determined upon the basis proposed for such an amendment, I would suggest that it might be a good idea to turn to our salaries and strike out compensation for the last four weeks. That is a motion I would cheerfully vote for. We have spent the past four weeks at the rate of \$1,000 an hour doing nothing except to obstruct the business of the country and also to decrease the public estimate of this body.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, does not the Senator think in the case of the Senator from New Hampshire, in view of the extra work he did, he ought to have his salary increased?

Mr. THOMAS. In view of the fact that one good result of the last filibuster will be to attract public attention to it in such wise as to bring about a change of our rules, I would be very glad to make an exception of my distinguished friend from New Hampshire, because I think he contributed more largely to that end than any gentleman on the other side of the Chamber through his display of such remarkable physical ability in keeping the floor as the tedious hours crept behind him.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, the Senator from Colorado would not leave himself out, in view of the very important contribution he made in the same direction.

Mr. THOMAS. No, Mr. President; I am willing to be included in the arrangement, if it is made, as I am a self-confessed obstructionist. I would make the single exception for the reason stated.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is strange how men differ in opinion upon any one of many subjects. I differ with the Senator from Colorado to this extent: I think the last 30 days' work in the Senate has been of greater benefit to the American people than any 30 days' work that has been undertaken in the Senate of the United States for many, many years.

Mr. GALLINGER. And saved \$50,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Not only have we saved \$50,000,000, but we have saved an un-American bill from being forced into law upon the American people. So far as I am concerned, I want to congratulate every Senator who took part in defeating that un-American legislation, and the American people are to be congratulated upon the success of the undertaking.

Mr. THOMAS. Before the present session expires I shall have a few words to say on that subject. I merely wish now to remark that there is nothing strange, I think, in the difference of opinion which the Senator from Utah and I entertain as to the result of the last four weeks' filibuster. I saw in one of the leading magazines this morning a picture of the distinguished Senator accompanied by a statement that he had accomplished the most remarkable feat of long and continued

soliloquy that has up to this time been inflicted upon the Senate furnishings, thus establishing his physical right to his seat and perhaps his claim to compensation. When we buy gas from the gas companies and pay them 75 cents per 1,000 cubic feet, we are apt to think that the price is extortionate; but the people have been paying at the rate of a thousand dollars an hour for the "hot air" supplied by distinguished Members of this body during the past four weeks—a price which I think is entirely out of all proportion to the value of the product.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I simply desire to appeal to Senators not to discuss the ship-purchase bill pending the consideration of this appropriation bill. We have just 13 days of this session, and we are trying to dispatch the necessary business of the Senate in order to avoid an extra session; so I appeal to Senators to let the discussion of abstract propositions and irrelevant matters pass by for the present. I appeal to them to aid in passing the supply bills in order that the wheels of government may go along and that we may avoid an extra session. We can not do that if we are to discuss the ship-purchase bill on the appropriation bill now before the Senate. I especially appeal to members of the Committee on Appropriations, like the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who, I know, is in accord with what I say, to forego a discussion of this sort to a more appropriate time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Virginia need fear that the Senate will filibuster against a bill which provides for its own compensation.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have not thought so; and yet it is mighty hard to distinguish this from a filibuster, when debate proceeds on irrelevant matters not at all connected with the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am in sympathy with what the Senator from Virginia has said. I assure him that I do not expect to take very much of the time of the Senate in discussing questions involved in this appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am sure the Senator agrees with me. All I want is a vote on this question.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], however, in just one word, as to the question of debate costing the Government \$1,000 an hour, it has been stated so often here that I sometimes think the American people have come to believe it. The expenditures of the Government go on whether we are in session or whether we are not in session. The people understand that. The mere fact of figuring out the cost as being so much an hour, while it may do for some advertising purposes, will not apply to actual results, so far as they concern the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true, Mr. President; the Government goes on, but the business is suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, the filibuster is now over, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. KENYON. I ask for the yeas and nays upon that proposition.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 2, line 9, after the word "Senators," to strike out "\$12,750" and insert "\$51,000," so as to make the clause read: For mileage of Senators, \$51,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for "Clerks and messengers to committees," on page 3, line 22, after "\$3,000," to insert "assistant clerk, \$1,800," so as to read: Banking and Currency—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$1,200.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Virginia the reason for increasing the clerical force of that committee, when we are engaged in trying to retrench, with a deficit already and a larger deficit in view? I do not suppose it is a matter of very much consequence; but how can we expect others to economize when we increase the expense? The whole body of Government takes its color, its tone, and its methods from those at the top. If, while we talk retrenchment and talk about endeavoring to save money and cut down the salaries of poor fellows in the executive departments and endeavor to reduce expenses for letter carriers, we go on continually increasing the expenses of our own work and our own friends and our own dependents and our own clerks, how can we expect cheerful submission to our reductions in the executive departments and with all the 460,000 employees in the country?

Retrenchment, like charity, should begin at home. This additional clerk for this committee may be needed. I do not know as to that; but what I do know is that we have got now two committees to do the work which up to a few months ago was done by only one. We have two sets of clerks, two clerical forces, two schedules of expense for a Committee on Finance and a Committee on Banking and Currency to do what was formerly done by one committee; done perfectly well, done adequately, and done satisfactorily. We have gone on and doubled that expense, and now we are asked to still further increase the expenditure, to make another place for another man, so that we shall add to the already doubled expenditure.

It is a little thing. I do not care so much about this particular case. But you can not have retrenchment and economy in the Government of the United States when the men whose duty it is to provide for it will not themselves practice it. I am against the amendment unless some reasons for it are given which have not as yet been given.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I realize the importance of retrenchment and economy, and the Committee on Appropriations have made a very earnest effort to accomplish those objects. We have put the knife in very deeply wherever we felt that we could possibly do so; indeed, the fear I have about this bill is that we have denied appropriations that we ought to have allowed. That has been the general policy of the committee.

So far as this particular item is concerned, it reduces itself simply to this: The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], appeared before the committee and stated that it was impossible for him to dispatch the work of the committee unless he had an additional clerk. The responsibility is on each Senator to deal frankly and squarely with the committee and with the Senate. I bring it home to the Senator from New York. Suppose he were to appear before the Committee on Appropriations and inform them that, by reason of his practical experience with the work of his committee, he found himself absolutely unable to do justice to the work committed to it; that it piled up on him; that he was unable to dispatch it; and he asked the committee to give him an additional clerk, what could the committee do? We must accept the statement of that Senator who is charged with a public duty; we must assume that he is dealing honestly and frankly with the committee; and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency says he can not do the work confided to him unless he has an additional clerk.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I think the committee could ask the Senator to state to them what is the work of the committee that can not be performed without additional assistance. That committee has completed the great labors for which it was separated from the Committee on Finance; that committee, with the force it had, was able to go through the long hearings and discussions and preparations incident to the banking and currency bill. There is nothing of particular consequence that occurs to me at this moment before that committee. I think the Committee on Appropriations might well have called upon the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee to state what was the exigency, and when he had stated it the committee might well have brought into the Senate that statement in order that the Senate might judge. You can not perform the duty of retrenchment on any such basis.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, the work now taken care of by the Committee on Banking and Currency is almost entirely new work. It is not a work which heretofore has been done by the Finance Committee. It is work that has been created by new legislation. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency did give the Committee on Appropriations the facts regarding this matter, and I am glad to say that he is now present and can himself, instead of my repeating what he said to the committee, state for himself the necessities of his committee.

Here is the rural-credits bill, which is inviting correspondence from every part of the United States, and an immense quantity of it, no doubt, for I myself get a great mass of correspondence relating to that matter, although I am not a member of that committee. But, as I have said, the Senator from Oklahoma did give to the committee good reasons, satisfying the committee that he needed another clerk. If he had not satisfied us, not only by his general statement, but by detailed facts that he presented, the committee would never have reported the allowance for the additional clerk. The committee believed, and still believes, that on the statements of fact made by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency the additional clerk ought to be allowed and paid for in the interest of the efficient dispatch of the public business.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. We have looked into the question of whether a new clerk is needed there, and the unanimous opinion of those who did look into it seemed to be in favor of allowing it.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us how many clerks that committee has now?

Mr. SHAFROTH. It has three clerks now; and there are about 10 committees in the United States Senate that have more help than has the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I want to say that in adopting the banking and currency act relating to the Federal reserve banks we started out with a policy of inviting criticisms of the law, and that has brought an enormous amount of correspondence to the chairman of the committee. Since that time the chairman of the committee has written a number of letters to various persons interested in the rural-credits bill, and that has caused an immense volume of correspondence. We have also under way an investigation as to the stock exchanges in the United States, and that has also brought forth not only a large amount of protests, but also a large amount of correspondence.

There are, as I have said, a number of committees in the Senate that have an amount appropriated for them, largely in excess of the amount which the Banking and Currency Committee asks, and there is no more important committee in the entire Senate than is the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. LODGE. Does not this amendment give practically four clerks to the committee?

Mr. SHAFROTH. It gives four clerks, including the one authorized by the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. The messenger is practically a clerk.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; including the messenger, this will make four clerks; and I desire to repeat that it is an important committee and should have that amount of help.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I do not wish to point out the fact that a dozen committees have a larger force than has the Committee on Banking and Currency. I do not think that has anything to do with the question. If the Banking and Currency Committee needs this service, it ought to have it.

We have had to deal with the Federal reserve act, of which the Senator from New York has spoken, and to which he refers as a concluded matter. It is not a concluded matter. The Committee on Banking and Currency is subjected to a constant flow of inquiries from the 25,000 banks of this country, which are asking questions every day about some feature of the Federal reserve act, wanting explanations about it, suggesting improvements in regard to it, and making objections concerning it. So that the committee have found it necessary to offer certain amendments to that act; and there is on the calendar now an amendment proposed which it has not been possible to have taken up because of the pressure of other business.

We have also before us a very important question affecting the codification of the national banking law, which ought to be disposed of, and which was under consideration heretofore by the Finance Committee, but is now before our committee.

The question of rural credits is also a very important one. There are two branches of the rural-credits subject, one affecting the landschaften system and the other the personal-credit system.

Then, also, the investigations made by the Pujo committee in regard to clearing houses and the regulation of stock exchanges is a matter which has occupied much attention of the committee and which involves a very large correspondence. The hearings on the question of regulating the stock exchanges embrace a thousand printed pages. The need for the additional assistance is obvious. I presented it to the committee and it ought to be granted.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question. He says that this extra work is largely the result of inquiries with reference to the new banking and currency act. Am I right about that? I understood the Senator to say that.

Mr. OWEN. In part; yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator also speaks of a bill that has not yet become a law.

Mr. OWEN. The rural credits bill has excited a very lively interest all over the country, and there are two aspects of that measure.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to ask the Senator whether the committee are engaged in any propaganda in favor of that bill, which requires extra assistance, or are they merely answering questions which may be asked?

Mr. OWEN. I will answer the Senator by saying that the committee, of course, is engaged in no propaganda, and I should like to know why the Senator asks that question.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I ask it because the committee have an unusual amount of assistance.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator is mistaken in saying the committee has an unusual amount of assistance. Every committee has three clerks. Even the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers has three clerks.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; the Senator is mistaken as to that.

Mr. OWEN. Perhaps I am, but I think not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think the Senator is mistaken. There are only two clerks and a messenger assigned to that committee, although the messenger may be a clerk. I do not dispute the Senator, except that he is not so designated.

Mr. SHAFROTH. They may not be designated as clerks, but neither has this committee more than two clerks, then, if that construction is placed upon the act of Congress. Every committee has three helpers, as they may be termed—two termed clerks and one termed a messenger; and that is all this committee has at the present time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am not disposed to make any point about the amount of help the committee requires. I think it is an important committee, and if it really needs this help I am not disposed to withhold it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for clerks to committees, on page 4, line 18, after the word "clerk," to strike out "\$1,440" and insert "\$1,800," so as to read:

Education and Labor—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk, \$1,800, messenger, \$1,440.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. It is not my purpose to take upon myself the burden of dealing with all the minor changes and amendments here, but this is another illustration of the same proposition which I made a few minutes ago—that retrenchment should begin at home; and I do not think we ought to adopt any provision which increases the clerical forces of our own committees or increases their salaries without having good reason given for it. I dare say a good reason can be given for this, but I want it given before I sit still and permit the increase to be made. I should like to know what the reason is.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] asked for that increase. He is present and he can explain it to the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I asked for that increase because I can not retain the assistant I have at less. There will be a very important matter before this committee during the coming session of Congress, the bill involving vocational education. He has had a large amount of correspondence during the past 12 months incident to that work and other educational work. It has grown. I am compelled to have as capable a man as I have to keep up with the work. I have to turn over a large amount of it to him, and he also aids in handling work before the departments. If Congress does not provide this amount, I shall have to pay it myself to keep the capable man who fills the place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read to line 18, on page 5, the last words read being as follows:

Finance—clerk \$3,000, assistant clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,600, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,440, two experts, one for the majority and one for the minority, at \$2,000 each.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if economy of business administration is desired, I suggest that here is a list of clerks, at least some of whom are entirely unnecessary. There are two experts added. They may have been necessary before in handling the tariff bill, but they certainly are not necessary now. The Finance Committee has very little to do at present. Banking and currency has been taken from the Finance Committee, and yet there are left for the Finance Committee a clerk at \$3,000, an assistant clerk at \$2,220, an assistant clerk at \$1,600, an assistant clerk at \$1,440, a messenger at \$1,440, and two experts at \$2,000 each. These men are in no sense needed by the committee. They are really the clerks of the chairman, except that one expert goes to the leader of the minority on the committee.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator can move to strike out the experts. They are not needed at this moment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move to strike out the experts.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I think that had better be passed over until the chairman of the committee is here and can be heard. He is not here now. He notified me that he had to go away. I do not think the amendment is in order at this time, anyhow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has already agreed to take up the bill first for committee amendments.

Mr. OVERMAN. This is not a committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But the amendment can, of course, be proposed.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply ask that that item go over for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over.

Mr. OVERMAN. The motion is not in order now, anyway, under the rules.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was in the item of appropriations for clerks to committees, on page 5, line 21, after the word "clerk," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$3,000," so as to read:

Foreign Relations—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk, \$2,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for clerks to committees, on page 6, line 5, after the word "clerk," where it occurs the second time, to strike out "\$2,220" and insert "\$2,500," so as to read:

Interoceanic Canals—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I think that calls for some explanation.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who is the chairman of that committee, appeared before the committee and insisted that he could not get along without this increase; that he could not keep an efficient man. He insisted on it.

Mr. ROOT. That is quite natural, Mr. President. The most admirable impulses of our nature tend to make every chairman of a committee desire to increase the pay of his clerks. Some of us increase the pay of our clerks out of our own pockets; but observe the process: One at a time, one after another, all these clerks will have their pay raised. That has already been done. While we are very stern about the pay of the clerks in the executive departments, we are very kind and considerate about the pay of clerks of Senate committees. It is demoralizing to see the men who fix the salaries applying two different rules to two different sets of clerks—the rule of strict economy to the poor fellows who do not have access to us, who do not have an opportunity to appeal to our kindly sympathies, and the rule of large-hearted generosity to the men we appoint ourselves and who are in daily contact with us.

I should like to see all their salaries increased, but I am yielding now to an impulse to say something for the men who have not any "pull"; to say something for the men who can not get at a Senator and work upon his sympathies. You go through the list of the employees of the Senate from top to bottom and you will find that for services no higher in character, no more important, calling for no greater ability or experience, we are paying our own favorites here 50 per cent more than we permit the men in the executive departments to be paid.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. ROOT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I am in entire sympathy with the line of the Senator's argument; but he made a statement a moment ago to the effect that he wanted to say something for the class of officials who could not get at Senators. If there is any such class here, I should like to know it, because I have been laboring under the delusion, based upon my own experience, that everyone in public office had no trouble at all in getting at Senators.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, if they do, they do not get at me. If they do get at any Senator, it is with a barrier of repulsion between him and them. The poor fellow who gets hold of a Senator in the lobby or on the street or elsewhere in his casual and ineffective way does not really get at him. These gentlemen who are in our committee rooms and working with us, and for whom we have regard and esteem and often affection, are the ones that really get at us. I should like to see their salaries increased; but, I repeat, we can not retrench, economize, and have cheerful and effective service when we apply two

different rules to Government employees; when we apply the rule of large generosity to our own friends and the rule of strict, severe, and parsimonious economy to the clerks.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, why does the Senator say that? If he will examine this bill, he will find that many of these department clerks get more salary. The first-class clerks get \$1,800. The Senator has been making a fight here against one clerk getting \$1,800.

Mr. ROOT. No, sir.

Mr. OVERMAN. Every first-class Government clerk in Washington gets \$1,800. That was as I understood the Senator.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I am not making a fight against a clerk getting \$1,800.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is what the Senator did a few minutes ago.

Mr. ROOT. No; I am making a fight against having these increases made without satisfactory evidence to the Senate that they ought to be made.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; but I take issue with the Senator when he says our clerks are paid more than the clerks in the departments, when if the Senator will examine this bill he will find that the heads of bureaus get three and four thousand dollars, every first-class clerk gets \$1,800, and many of them are getting \$2,700. I say that the department clerks, according to their ratings, are paid higher than our own clerks. Let the Senator go through the bill and see if that is not so.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I have been through these appropriation bills many times, and I am pretty familiar with the salaries that are paid to the department clerks. I oppose the proposition of the Senator from North Carolina with the assertion that our men are paid 50 per cent higher for similar service than the men in the departments.

Mr. OVERMAN. I take issue with the Senator. The Senator can take up any department in this bill—I do not care which one he takes up—and he will find that the clerks of the same class are paid higher than the Senators' clerks. The Senators' clerks, as a rule, get \$1,440. Some of them, a few of them, get \$1,800. Every first-class clerk in the departments gets \$1,800; every second-class clerk gets \$1,600; every third-class clerk gets \$1,400; so most of our clerks only get what a third-class clerk in the department gets. Let the Senator examine the bill, and he will find that is true.

Mr. ROOT. The great bulk of the clerks in the departments get from \$720 to \$1,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. Why, Mr. President—

Mr. ROOT. Our clerks at the head of these committees get either the same or within \$500 of the salary of the chief clerk of a whole executive department.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, let us take up one department. You can take up any of them. My eye falls on the Office of the Auditor for the War Department:

Auditor, \$4,000.

There is not a first-class clerk in the Senate that gets \$4,000.

Mr. ROOT. There is not? Right here—

Mr. OVERMAN. The next item is:

Assistant and chief clerk, \$2,250.

That is about what a majority of them get. Then there is a law clerk, \$2,000; chief of division of accounts, \$2,500; chief of division, \$2,000; 2 assistant chiefs of division, at \$1,900 each; chief transportation clerk, \$2,000; clerks, 22 of class 4, \$1,800 each. So these clerks in the departments are paid 50 per cent higher, instead of 50 per cent less, than ours of the same grade.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, what is it that these clerks of committees have to do compared with the work which the men in the departments have to do? The functions of our committee clerks are practically on a level with the functions of the clerks in the departments who are now in class 1, class 2, class 3, and class 4.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator will yield further, the Senator says they do not have the same character of work, and he also made the statement that the clerks of Senators were paid more than the clerks in the departments. Now, I am going to take another one. Right on the next page, on page 42, is the Office of the Comptroller of the Treasury:

Comptroller, \$6,000; assistant comptroller, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$2,500; chief law clerk, \$2,500; law clerks revising accounts and briefing opinions—1, \$2,100; 8, at \$2,000 each; expert accountants—6, at \$2,000 each; private secretary, \$1,800; clerks—8 of class 4; 3 of class 3; 1 of class 2—

And so forth. I will tell the Senator that if he will examine the matter, as I hope he will do, he will agree with me that our clerks are not paid salaries equal to those of clerks who are doing the same class of work in the departments. I do not care what department we take.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. ROOT. In the first place let me observe that I do not agree with the Senator from North Carolina at all and I propose to call attention to some of the facts in this very bill.

Mr. MYERS. Will the Senator yield at this juncture?

Mr. ROOT. I will.

Mr. MYERS. I want to call the attention of Senators to the fact that employees in the Government departments begin work at 9 o'clock in the morning and quit at 4.30 in the afternoon, and it is my understanding that during the summer time they get every Saturday afternoon off and they get 30 days holiday during the year. The clerk of the Senate Committee on Public Lands has been working all winter from 8 o'clock in the morning until 7 at night, and often after dinner, and every Sunday as a rule, and both the stenographers of that committee have kept about the same or pretty nearly the same hours. The employees of committees I know often have to do all the work for Senators and the Senate work, and they have no such opportunities as civil-service employees in the departments of the Government. They have no such privileges and promotions. I know that is true in very many instances. I know it is true of the Senate Committee on Public Lands. The employees of that committee and of Senators often have to handle important, weighty, and responsible matters which require considerable skill and judgment and amount to more than the ordinary routine work of department employees.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. POMERENE. I merely wish to suggest another fact to the Senator. My committee is not asking for any increased pay, but I think we would be justified in doing it, considering the amount of work. Of course, the most of it comes to me perhaps as a Senator rather than as chairman of the committee. But I want to suggest this thought to the Senator: Within the last few years we have been in constant session here, probably 10 months in the year. The salaries which our clerks are getting were for the most part fixed years ago when the Senate was in session hardly six months in a year, and now, when they are required to be here almost twice as long as they were some years ago, their salaries are not proportionately increased. When it comes to clerks in the departments I am not aware that the character of their work has very materially changed; but I do know that in some of the departments and bureaus there are twice as many clerks now as there ought to be.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I will agree that there are a great deal nearer twice as many during the last two years.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, to what extent have they increased in the last two years over what they were before?

Mr. ROOT. I was agreeing about it with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I understood the Senator to make the statement that in the last two years there were more than there ought to have been.

Mr. ROOT. That was the extent of my agreement with the Senator from Ohio. It is his proposition, not mine.

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator mean to say by that that there were not more clerks in those departments two years ago than there should have been?

Mr. ROOT. No; I do not mean to say anything about it. I meant to limit my agreement. The Senator made a proposition, and I agree with it up to a certain extent.

Mr. POMERENE. That is certainly a very clever limitation.

Mr. ROOT. Well, I am very glad to have the approval of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not think that we differ very much on that subject.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, let me call attention now to the clerks upon the page that I open in this bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. What page?

Mr. ROOT. Page 43. It begins: Office of Auditor for Treasury Department: Auditor, \$4,000; chief clerk and chief of division, \$2,250; law clerk, \$2,000; two chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; clerks—18 of class 4, that is, \$1,800; 15 of class 3, that is, \$1,600; 13 of class 2, that is, \$1,400, and lower than the lowest clerk's salary that we pay; 31 of class 1, that is, \$1,200, the salary we pay to a messenger and lower than any salary paid to any clerk of any committee. There are 31 of that class. Nine at \$1,000 each, that is, \$200 less than we pay to a messenger. Four at \$900 each, \$300 less than we pay to a messenger. Three assistant messengers, and so forth.

Office of the Auditor for the War Department: Auditor, \$4,000; assistant and chief clerk, \$2,250; law clerk, \$2,000; chief of divisions of accounts, \$2,500; chief of division, \$2,000; 2 as-

sistant chiefs of division, \$1,900 each; chief transportation clerk, \$2,000; clerks—22 of class 4, that is, \$1,800; 49 of class 3, that is, \$1,600; 55 of class 2, that is, \$1,400; 45 of class 1, that is, \$1,200; 9 at \$1,000 each; and 3 at \$900 each. For the Office of the Auditor for the Navy Department, I find 13 of class 4; 22 of class 3, at \$1,600; 20 of class 2, at \$1,400; 23 of class 1, at \$1,200. So I can go through this bill.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] calls my attention to the Post Office appropriation bill as reported from the committee.

Mr. OVERMAN. On what page?

Mr. ROOT. On page 24. By this it appears that there are 466 clerks of grade 10, not exceeding \$1,800 each; 1,658 of grade 9, not exceeding \$1,700 each; 601 of grade 8, not exceeding \$1,600 each; 6,985 of grade 7, at not exceeding \$1,500 each; 2,041 of grade 6, at not exceeding \$1,400 each; 1,839 of grade 5, not exceeding \$1,300 each; 2,441 of grade 4, not exceeding \$1,200 each, our messengers' pay; 2,672 of grade 3, at not exceeding \$1,100 each, less than our messengers' pay; 2,429 of grade 2, at not exceeding \$1,000 each, \$200 less than our messengers' pay; 2,213 of grade 1, at not exceeding \$900 each, \$300 less than our messengers' pay. Altogether, as the Senator from Michigan has footed it up, 19,863 clerks in the Railway Mail Service at less than \$1,500 a year.

I say, sir, upon a long experience and observation both of the executive departments and of the legislative work of the Senate, the duties performed by these thousands of clerks, who receive no more pay or less pay than our messengers, are equal in dignity, importance, and difficulty to the work of any clerks of our Senate committees with the exception of not more than a dozen.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator has forgotten probably the fact that every one of those clerks is entitled to promotion. They go in at \$1,200, and they go up to \$1,400 and \$1,600 and \$1,800. Our clerks have no chance of promotion; they have no 8-hour law; they work 10 and 12 hours in a day. The department clerks work from 8 o'clock until 4 o'clock and have the balance of the day. I still maintain that the clerks in the departments get a larger salary, relatively, than our clerks.

Our clerks are called messengers, but the Senator knows that they are the hardest-worked clerks we have, and that some of the most efficient are called messengers. The typewriters and stenographers are generally called messengers.

Now, take the Department of State, which the Senator presided over so ably. He will find that the clerks of that department are getting a great deal higher pay, where they receive salaries that have not been changed since the Senator was the head of that great department. I should like to see some of the clerks in that department get more; I do not think they are probably paid as high as they ought to be paid; but I say the same grade of clerks in the departments certainly get more, and I still maintain that they get more than Senators' clerks.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, without discussing the proposition as to the pay of the clerks of Senate committees, I call attention to the condition in the department with reference to clerks. Recently there has been an investigation by the efficiency department, as it is called of the Civil Service Commission. Upon a scientific examination of the force in the Office of the Treasurer of the United States, it was found that the office could be conducted for \$40,000 a year less than it is being conducted; that there were a great many superfluous clerks there.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; Mr. President, that is true; but—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just one word more. In order to try out the proposition as to whether these superfluous clerks could be dispensed with the man in charge of the investigation segregated the superfluous clerks and asked them not to go to work. He would go and find that they were working. They were afraid that they would lose their positions, and they insisted on working. In order to carry out the test he had to take these superfluous employees and put them in another room, and herd them in there to keep them from working, assuring them all the time that they were not going to lose their positions, explaining to them what the purpose of the investigation was, and supplying them with magazines and newspapers. They were kept there in idleness and forced to remain in idleness in order to run that office on an economical and businesslike basis. I venture to say the same condition exists in very many of the offices of all the departments of the Government.

Mr. OVERMAN. I admit that is true; but a great many clerks have been discharged. There has been great saving in one of the departments, and this investigation is going on. In one department since we considered the bill we found we could dispense with a thousand clerks. I am not fighting the salaries

of clerks and I am not asking for an increase of any salaries here, but I do think the Senator from New York was wrong when he said that the clerks in the departments are paid lower salaries than clerks of Senators. When he takes into consideration the fact that every one of those clerks is entitled to promotion, that they are continually promoted. There are three or four grades under the civil service, and a clerk who goes in at the \$1,400 grade is then promoted to the \$1,600 grade, and then to the \$1,800 grade. Never, as long as time lasts, will one of our clerks be promoted. Then, those clerks have their hours from 9 to 4 or 4.30 o'clock. Our poor clerks work day in and day out and night in and night out. When you take that into consideration I say our clerks are paid much less than any clerks on earth.

Mr. President, I do not want to prolong this debate. All I ask is that the Senator from New York will go with me some time and look into the matter. I do not propose to relieve the Department of State of its clerks. I think they are valuable clerks, and probably ought to be paid more than any other clerks. They are pretty valuable people.

Mr. ROOT. Yes; they are good clerks.

Mr. OVERMAN. I doubt whether the clerk in the Senator's office gets fourteen hundred dollars—

Mr. ROOT. Under ordinary circumstances they have a vacation half the time.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not for the last six years.

Mr. ROOT. It is to be hoped that those conditions will not continue. Since that subject has been brought up, I want to say that we, in considering the labors of these clerks, ought not to assume that the bad practice of the last few years is to be continued. If we are going to have good legislation, we must not continue it. The city of Washington is like a boiler shop, and the Members of the Senate and the House have the sounds of strife and of political movement dinning into their ears continually, until after a time they can not hear from home. They can not hear from the real thought and feeling of the people of the United States. The Members of the Senate and the House ought to go home and live there a considerable part of every year, so that they may get into touch with their constituents and reorient themselves and get an idea of what the country is thinking and feeling, instead of staying here and squabbling 12 months in the year and getting every month farther and farther away from a real appreciation of the feeling and opinion and purpose and needs of their constituents.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will not take any issue with the Senator on that question.

Mr. ROOT. Therefore we are not to assume that these clerks are to work 12 months in the year, but we are to hope and expect that Congress will go back to the good old practice of coming here and considering legislation during a reasonable period and then going home to get into touch with the people of the country, allowing their clerks a reasonable vacation.

Mr. President, there is one thing I want to refer to. The particular question is upon the increase of the salary of a clerk for the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals. I would like to ask how many meetings of the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals there have been during the present session of Congress? I am informed there has not been one meeting of that committee since the tolls question was disposed of, nearly a year ago.

Mr. THOMAS. There were meetings of the committee upon the tolls bill, which constitutes the only business that committee has had since I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. ROOT. Very well. Then, sir, for what is it that we are to increase the compensation of this clerk?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to answer that. Because the chairman of the committee has insisted upon having a \$3,000 head of the clerical force of that committee instead of one at \$2,500.

Mr. ROOT. How did he confine himself to that demand? Why did he not make it \$12,000?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, Mr. President, there is this feature about this particular case: It is an increase here of \$280. The Senator who is chairman of that committee represents the great State of New York and he has a degree of correspondence that is enormous. There is no doubt about that. Is it possible that we are to consider a man who has such a large constituency as not being entitled to have proper help in his work? We find as a matter of fact that when men come from large States there ought to be some concession made to them with respect to their clerks, and there generally is, because they represent generally a constituency with whom they have a large amount of correspondence. While his committee may not meet often there is continual correspondence between the Senator and his constituents.

It seems to me that this is a great amount of talk to be made over an increase of \$280 a year. People differ in regard to what the expenditures of the Government should be. Some men think that if we make an increase of \$100 or \$200 it is extravagant. Other people think that expenditures in other directions are very extravagant.

Mr. President, the Senator from New York himself introduced a bill at the last session of Congress to erect a monument up at Lake Champlain for \$250,000 and it was given. For an ornamental purpose, at a time when the Government is not making expenditures, it seems—

Mr. ROOT. May I ask the Senator from Colorado whether this is an ornamental matter?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; it is not. It is more a useful than an ornamental matter. Whenever you come to the question of an appropriation for something that is ornamental, of all times when you can dispense with it is a time when the Government revenues are not equal to the expenditures.

Now, I do not blame the Senator. I think his idea in regard to what is extravagant and what is not extravagant is different from that of other people. I have been a member of the Committee on Contingent Expenses of the Senate and continually Senators come there wanting some additional help. We have been generally trying to fight them and trying to make the allowances just as low as we reasonably can. In the same way in the Committee on Appropriations we endeavor to do it. A claim comes in for an increase of \$3,000 and we try to cut it down to \$2,500. From my knowledge concerning these matters, while as a matter of fact we try to cut them down, yet there is merit in almost every application that is made. It seems to me, Mr. President, that this increase ought to be allowed.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] alluded to the great amount of extra work that the Senator from New York and his office force have to perform and which he has to perform as a Senator on account of the great constituency which he represents. Mr. President, I represent a constituency only second to that of the Senator from New York, and yet at the opening of this session of Congress the salary of my principal clerk was reduced from what he formerly received, \$2,220, to \$2,000, and the salary of my assistant clerk was reduced from \$1,440 to \$1,200. Both these men have exactly the same amount of work to perform that they had two years ago and both of them have just as much to do in the way of attending to correspondence on account of the great constituency that I represent as the clerks of the Senator from New York.

This brings me to the point of the great favoritism that is shown by giving the assistants of one Senator one amount of pay and of another Senator another amount of pay for exactly the same kind, quantity, and quality of work. That is the point which is made, and I think that is what is in the mind of the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR] in objecting to the increase, not as a matter perhaps of extravagance but of extreme favoritism.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator if the reduction which he complains of was not caused by the fact that he held the chairmanship of a committee more than two years ago, the clerk of which had a salary of \$2,250 a year, and he has had an assignment as chairman of another committee the clerk of which receives a less amount?

Mr. OLIVER. It was not, Mr. President. I happened to be then in the same position that is now occupied by the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], chairman of a committee which never had any work to do, a committee which might be called a "paper committee," and now I do not happen to be chairman of any committee, but my office force has just as much work to do as it had then. It has the work that pertains to other committees of which I am a member, though not a chairman. I am a member of several important committees of the Senate, and all of them entail work upon me and work upon my office force. I with my colleague attend to all the wants of all the nearly 9,000,000 people of Pennsylvania. The correspondence connected with that requires work, and my clerk is just as much entitled to \$2,500 a year as is the clerk of the Senator from New York, because he does just as much work and his work is worth just as much money.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator whether there has been any reduction in the pay of any of these clerks from four years ago up to the present time.

Mr. OLIVER. There has been a reduction in the salary of my clerk of \$280.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That was by reason of the fact—

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield to me, I wish to say that what the Senator from Pennsylvania

describes as occurring in his clerical force occurred in exactly the same way in my clerical force.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That was because the Senator lost his chairmanship. Is not that the fact?

Mr. LIPPITT. It does not make any difference what chairmanship was lost, the fact is that two men in my office allowed to me by the provisions of this bill had their salaries reduced some \$200 apiece. The amount of work that they had to perform, the number of hours that they had to use in performing that work, and their capacity and efficiency are exactly the same as they were before our good friends on the other side of the Chamber came into power. What really happened was that the clerks of some Senators had their salaries increased and others had their salaries cut down.

Mr. SHAFROTH. There have been very few that have been increased.

Mr. LIPPITT. I know that the salaries of my men were cut down, and I made it up out of my personal pocket.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator will find that it was because he lost the chairmanship of his committee. A certain salary is attached to the clerk of a Senator who has a chairmanship, and when a person has not a chairmanship that salary does not apply. That has been the rule the last four or five years, and there has been no change made with respect to it.

Mr. OLIVER. That is an explanation perhaps, but it is not a defense.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Colorado a question. There are two grounds on which the pay of clerks is based. One is a committee like the Banking and Currency Committee, where the work of the committee requires it. Now, the Senator is placing his defense of this increase in the case of the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals. He can not put it on the ground of the work of the committee, because the committee does not meet, but he puts it on the ground of the personal work which the Senator from the great State of New York is called upon to do, which I entirely recognize. But why is one Senator from New York, independent of the committee, entitled to a still further increase when the other Senator from New York, with precisely the same work, is not entitled to it—if you put it on that basis?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have no doubt if the Senator from New York would appear before the committee and represent that his clerks are unable to do his work there would be some increase added to the force. As a matter of fact, there are two elements that enter into the salary of clerks. One is the element of committee work and the other is the element of the large correspondence with constituents. Both of them are matters that should be taken into consideration in determining the question.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, if it had occurred to me that my colleague was chairman of the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals and I had known he wanted this increase for his personal convenience—not for the affairs of the committee but for his own correspondence—I should not have selected this particular increase for the purpose of pointing my moral; but I did it without realizing that it was the committee of my colleague. So long, however, as it is up and it is put upon the personal ground, I can only say that it is a very fortunate thing for the gentleman who is engaged in writing out the correspondence of the Democratic Senator from the State of New York, because of his employer's politics, his services are to be rated at \$2,500 a year and his salary to be increased, while the gentleman who is doing the same thing for the Republican Senator from New York has his salary cut down to \$2,000. I did apply, I did protest, I did say to the committee that the great correspondence that was incident to being one of the representatives of 10,000,000 people called for a very great amount of labor compared with that of the representatives of smaller States; but the salary of my friend and assistant was cut down, and I shall sit and see, with a mild degree of envy, the salary of the friend and assistant of my colleague increased upon purely political grounds, and none other.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to state to the senior Senator from New York that the junior Senator from New York appeared before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate nearly two years ago and insisted upon an increase of this particular salary, but the committee refused it. There have been one or two applications made there by him; and as a compromise of matters, while the inter-oceanic canal bill was before the Senate, we agreed that he should be allowed the increase for one or two months only, but outside of that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate refused it, not because his clerk

was a Democrat or because the other clerk might be a Republican.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have not the slightest idea of following this debate through all of the collateral and irrelevant matters that have been discussed. The proposition is a very simple one and a very narrow one. It is to add \$280 per annum to the salary of the clerk of the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals. The Committee on Appropriations thought that \$280 ought to be added to his salary, and they so reported. It may be that the committee was in error, but all the Senate have to do is to vote on the matter. That is all I ask them to do. If they do not think this \$280 ought to be allowed, let them vote down the proposition. If they think it ought to be allowed, let them sustain the committee. I have, however, no pride of opinion about it, and will not be hurt in the slightest degree if the committee is overruled, but I must say a word in defense of the committee from the attack made on it by the Senator from New York [Mr. Root].

The Senator from New York started out with the statement that the committee had not dealt fairly in this matter of salaries, and that he wanted to say something for those who had been treated unfairly. The Senator from New York may be the only fair man in the Senate; evidently he thinks so, but I differ from him. I believe he is as fair as anyone else, but I do not think he has a monopoly of fairness.

I think the Committee on Appropriations have dealt with this matter as fairly as they could deal with it. The committee are not infallible; they may have made a mistake in this instance, and I am perfectly willing for the Senate to overrule it, but I must resent the imputation that has been made that the committee has not dealt fairly in fixing these salaries, and that is exactly what the Senator from New York said.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia is mistaken. I made no imputation upon the committee. The Committee on Appropriations does not fix the salaries; the Senate fixes the salaries. What I said applied to the Senate, and it included me as well as it did every other Senator.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Well, I thought the Senator was referring to this report and that is the way I understood it, and I think that would be the interpretation of anybody who listened to his remarks. The question was on the action of the committee; the Senate had not increased this salary by \$280; the committee had reported in favor of it, and the committee, and nobody else, had done it.

Mr. OVERMAN. The committee recommended it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The committee recommended it, and the Senate has not acted upon it. So the charge of unfairness could not have applied to the Senate when the Senate has not acted on it at all, but could apply only to the committee. The committee have dealt as fairly with it as they are able to deal and with just as much fairness as the Senator from New York has done. He is a little too free in making accusations against the motives of other people. It is a very difficult work which the Committee on Appropriations have to perform. They are besieged and beset with appeals of all sorts for all kinds of appropriations, and particularly for increases in salaries. We have endeavored to deal as fairly with the matter as we could, and we think we have dealt fairly with it. We have reported this little increase of \$280 for the clerk of the Senator's colleague. If the Senator does not want to allow that increase, all I ask is that the vote be taken and that the matter be settled in accordance with the judgment of the Senate, which will be perfectly satisfactory to me. I am exceedingly anxious to see progress made on this bill. I would rather have seen it voted out at the start than to have spent a great deal more than \$280, which this discussion has no doubt cost. I do hope that we can have a vote on the amendment and settle it in accordance with the judgment of the Senate.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I am going to take but a moment, I will say to the chairman of the committee; but I want to state that I am glad this discussion has come up, because it emphasizes the same point I tried to make a little while ago in discussing this very matter.

It seems to me there is more injustice and more inequity in the provisions of this bill than you would find in any appropriation bill that comes before this body, not as comparing our employees with the other employees of the Government, but in equity and in justice among our own employees. That grows out of the system the Senate has adopted with reference to fixing the salaries of its own employees. That side of the Chamber is not to blame for it. It grew up under the Republican administration; it has come down to us, and the same system is being followed now that was followed under the preceding

Republican administration. So it can not be charged to partisanship or to that side of the Chamber, or anything of the kind, but we have adopted no system at all with reference to fixing the salaries of the employees of the Senate.

I have offered an amendment, and have had it printed, which I expect to propose when the proper time comes, changing the present system and providing for salaries for the clerks of Senators, and so on. It seems to me that we ought to do this. There is not a Senator from any State in the Union but is entitled to a secretary of high-class ability.

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator mean to provide for clerks of committees, or of Senators individually and not for committees?

Mr. JONES. No; I propose to provide clerks for committees and also for Senators individually. I merely want to state briefly what I just now stated, that every Senator, no matter from what State he comes, big or little, ought to have at least one good man as his secretary. No matter what the size of the State, that man will have everything that he can do during all the time that he can give to his work. So it seems to me that every Senator ought to have a clerk, to be paid exactly the same salary.

I provide in my amendment that every Senator shall have a clerk, to be paid \$2,500 a year. Take the Senator from New York. We give his clerk \$2,500 a year because that Senator comes from a great State. That is true; and yet the secretary of the Senator from Rhode Island does just as much work and has just as much work to do as has the secretary of the Senator from New York, because each secretary can only do so much. No doubt more work comes to the Senator from New York than comes to the Senator from Rhode Island; but that should be met by additional help, and not by increasing the salary, for a man can not do any more than the secretary of the Senator from Rhode Island has to do and must do. Due allowance can be made for that increased work by providing additional assistance, and that is what we ought to do.

I have provided in my amendment, in brief, this: I recognize that there are certain committees that do a great deal of committee work, and I provide clerks for the Committees on Commerce, Appropriations, the District of Columbia, Finance, Foreign Relations, Interstate Commerce, the Judiciary, Banking and Currency, Public Lands, and Post Offices and Post Roads. I propose to give each of those committees a clerk at \$2,750 per year.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I notice the Senator from Washington has included the Committee on the District of Columbia as doing some work. Has the Senator any knowledge that the Committee on the District of Columbia, as a committee, has done any work?

Mr. JONES. I have.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, can the Senator tell us when that committee had a meeting?

Mr. JONES. I can tell when they have not had a meeting.

Mr. NORRIS. I know that very well. Has the committee reported a bill at this session of Congress?

Mr. JONES. I do not care to refer to the committee. I want to say that that committee has a great many bills and a great many matters that ought to be considered.

Mr. NORRIS. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. JONES. The committee, for some reason, has not had any meeting at this session of Congress. I know that in the preceding Congress that committee met regularly every week; that it had many bills before it; and that it reported out a great many of them.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say to the Senator from Washington that I am in entire sympathy with his plan. I do not know about all its details, but I think he is calling attention to a serious proposition here, and one that ought to be remedied. I do not believe there is any doubt about that; but when I see a committee like the Committee on the District of Columbia classified as one of the great committees, and then try to get a bill reported out of that committee, or even to get it considered by that committee, and I find that they never meet, I think they ought to have the same clerical help that the Committee for the Disposition of Useless Papers have.

Mr. JONES. I want to say as to the Committee on the District of Columbia not holding meetings, that it has only occurred in the last year or so, as I remember. In the preceding Congress the committee met every week, and sometimes two or three times a week; it had hearings and considered various bills and made many reports, and it was one of the most active

committees of the Senate. During the present Congress it has had a great many bills before it. So that, altogether, I thought that it should be included in this list.

Then I give these committees a messenger during the sessions of Congress. It is a fact, as every Senator knows, that there are many committees of this body the employees of which, when the Senate is not in session, have nothing to do. That is something which we ought to remedy; we ought to change it. If Congress adjourns on the 4th of March, as we hope, and does not convene again until December, there are many, many employees of the Senate who will have absolutely nothing to do during all that period of time. That can be taken care of and ought to be taken care of by Congress providing that these places shall be filled while Congress is in session.

Without going further into that, I have included some other committees in the proposed amendment; but I will not stop now to go into the matter fully. I provide that each Senator shall have a clerk at \$2,500 a year and an assistant clerk at \$1,500 a year. That would allow a Senator to have a clerk remain in Washington when the Senator himself is not here, and also to have one at his home when he needs one there. I do not know how it is with most Senators; but I will say frankly that I could get along—and I have probably about as much work as any Senator here, outside of the chairmen of some of the big committees—I could get along when Congress is not in session with one clerk at home and one clerk or an assistant clerk here in Washington. Then, when the Senate is in session, I provide for a stenographer at \$1,440.

If we would adopt some such plan as that—I do not say that that is the best plan—but if we could adopt some basis like that it would be more equitable, and we could save money for the Government of the United States.

I have the assurance of the chairman of the Committee on Rules that that committee is going to give this matter during the coming summer the most careful consideration, and will try to work out a method of reorganizing the committees of the Senate. There are about 51 of these committees that ought to be done away with absolutely. They are simply a fraud, a subterfuge, to secure additional help that Senators need as Senators and not as chairmen of committees.

Now, Mr. President, I am not going to take further time in regard to the pending amendment. The Senator from New York needs the additional help, so far as that is concerned, but he does not need that help any more than does his colleague from his own State. It simply illustrates the injustice of the system under which we give to the secretary of one Senator from a certain State \$2,500 and the secretary of the other Senator from the same State \$2,000.

I shall offer the amendment to which I have referred at the proper time; but I promise the chairman of the committee that I will not take very much time then to discuss it. As I have said, we have the assurance of the Committee on Rules that they are going to look into this matter and try to work out a more equitable system in the administration of the affairs of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the item of appropriation for clerks to committees, on page 8, line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$423,740" and insert "\$426,680."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 4, to insert:

For additional amount for the clerk to the Committee on Rules for revising and preparing for publication biennially, under the direction of the committee, the Senate Manual, to be immediately available, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 8, to insert:

For compiling the Navy Yearbook for the calendar year 1914, under the direction of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, on page 8, line 18, after the word "each," to insert "1, \$1,050," so as to read:

Messengers—4 (acting as assistant doorkeepers) at \$1,800 each; 32 at \$1,440 each; 1, \$1,050; 1, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, on page 9, line 12, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$139,680" and insert "\$140,730."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 20, after the word "folders," to strike out "six" and insert "seven," and, in line 21, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$16,720" and insert "\$17,720," so as to make the clause read:

Folding room: Foreman, \$1,400; assistant, \$1,400; clerk, \$1,200; folders—7 at \$1,000 each, 8 at \$840 each; in all, \$17,720.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 19, to insert: For driving, maintenance, and care of automobile for the Vice President, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. On page 10, line 22, I move to strike out "\$2,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$1,500."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHBURST in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, line 22, after the word "folding," it is proposed to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$1,500," so as to read:

For materials for folding, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 12, line 18, after the word "Commissioners," to strike out "\$43,750" and insert "\$175,000," so as to make the clause read:

For mileage of Representatives, Delegates, and expenses of Resident Commissioners, \$175,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for office of Doorkeeper, on page 19, line 2, before the word "preceding," to strike out "eight" and insert "seven," so as to make the clause read:

Successors to any of the employees provided for in the seven preceding paragraphs may be named by the House of Representatives at any time.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 21, to insert: For driving, maintenance, and operation of automobile for the Speaker of the House of Representatives, \$1,500.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question as to this item for driving, maintenance, and operation of automobile for the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Why was not that inserted by the House? Why is the Senate called upon to insert that item?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I do not know why the House did not insert it; but we put in \$1,500 for the expenses of the automobile of the Vice President, and we felt that it was hardly a consistent course that it should not be provided for both. I know that the House people were over here and asked us to do it. I do not know whether it was an accident or how it was, but I know that we were appealed to from the House side to make the same provision there that we made for the Vice President. The \$1,500 is a meager allowance, and will not be fully equal to the expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Library of Congress," on page 25, after line 6, to insert:

Legislative reference: To enable the Librarian of Congress to employ competent persons to gather, classify, and make available, in translations, indexes, digests, compilations, and bulletins, and otherwise, data for or bearing upon legislation, and to render such data serviceable to Congress and committees and Members thereof, and for the acquisition of material required for their work, and for other expenses incidental thereto, \$25,000, together with the unexpended balance, if any, of the sum appropriated under the head of "Legislative reference" for the fiscal year 1915.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if this is the same amount that was carried in the previous bill for this work?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Exactly the same, according to my understanding.

Mr. KENYON. I think it is a very useful thing and is getting to be a very necessary thing.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I started out with some prejudice against it, but some experience with it has satisfied me that it is useful and that the appropriation ought to be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 21, after "\$1,600," to strike out "one \$1,500" and insert "three at \$1,500 each"; in line 22, before the words "at \$1,400," to strike out "two" and insert "three"; and on page 26, line 4, after the word "Librarian," to strike out "\$35,100" and insert "\$39,500," so as to make the clause read:

Distribution of card indexes: For service in connection with distribution of card indexes and other publications of the Library, including the following salaries now authorized and being paid: Chief of division, \$3,000; chief assistant, \$1,800; assistants—1 \$1,600, 3 at \$1,500 each, 3 at \$1,400 each, 3 at \$1,200 each, 2 at \$1,100 each, 3 at \$1,000 each; and for services of assistants at salaries less than \$1,000 per annum and for piecework and work by the hour, \$15,600, including not exceeding \$500 for freight charges, expressage, traveling expenses connected with such distribution, and expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian, \$39,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 15, to strike out:

The Librarian of Congress shall hereafter perform the duties, except those of disbursing officer, required of the superintendent of the building of the Library of Congress as provided in the act approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. L., 545).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 21, to strike out:

The Librarian of Congress is authorized to appoint a disbursing clerk, who shall also act as assistant superintendent of the Library building and grounds and perform the duties of disbursing clerk under the aforesaid act and the act approved July 19, 1897 (30 Stat. L., p. 136). The disbursing clerk shall give bond in such sum as the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine and shall receive a salary of \$2,500 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that I shall offer an amendment on line 5, page 28, after the committee amendments have been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The notice of the Senator from Utah will be noted.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 5, after the word "grounds," to strike out "Disbursing clerk and assistant superintendent, \$2,500," and insert "Superintendent, \$3,000, and the salary of the superintendent of the Library building and grounds shall, from and after the passage of this act, be at the rate of \$3,000 per annum, and the amount appropriated for the salary of said superintendent for the balance of the fiscal year 1915 shall be available for the payment of said salary at the rate of \$3,000 per annum"; in line 13, after the words "clerks," to insert "1 \$2,000"; and in line 26, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$74,345" and insert "\$76,845," so as to make the clause read:

Library building and grounds: Superintendent, \$3,000, and the salary of the superintendent of the Library building and grounds shall, from and after the passage of this act, be at the rate of \$3,000 per annum, and the amount appropriated for the salary of said superintendent for the balance of the fiscal year 1915 shall be available for the payment of said salary at the rate of \$3,000 per annum; clerks—1 \$2,000, 1 \$1,600, 1 \$1,400, 1 \$1,000; messenger; assistant messenger; telephone switchboard operator; assistant telephone switchboard operator; captain of watch, \$1,400; lieutenant of watch, \$1,000; 16 watchmen, at \$900 each; carpenter, painter, and foreman of laborers, at \$900 each; 14 laborers, at \$540 each; 2 attendants in ladies' room, at \$480 each; 4 check boys, at \$360 each; mistress of charwomen, \$425; assistant mistress of charwomen, \$300; 58 charwomen; chief engineer, \$1,500; assistant engineers—1 \$1,200, 3 at \$900 each; electrician, \$1,500; machinists—1 \$1,000, 1 \$900; 2 wiremen, at \$900 each; plumber, \$900; 3 elevator conductors, and 10 skilled laborers, at \$720 each; in all \$76,845.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that amendment may be passed over.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. May I ask the Senator why he wants it to go over?

Mr. SMOOT. I want it to go over because I want to offer an amendment to it.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. Let the committee amendment be agreed to, and then the Senator from Utah can offer his amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose my amendment would not interfere with the committee amendment, and therefore I have no objection to its being agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has no objection to its being agreed to at this time?

Mr. SMOOT. No. I simply give notice that at the proper time I shall offer an amendment which does not affect the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Botanic Garden," on page 29, line 17, after the word "Congress," to strike

out "\$14,593.75" and insert "\$16,593.75," so as to make the clause read:

For assistants and laborers, under the direction of the Joint Library Committee of Congress, \$16,593.75.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 23, after the word "Congress," to strike out "\$6,500" and insert "\$8,500," so as to make the clause read:

For procuring manure, soil, tools, fuel, purchasing trees, shrubs, plants, and seeds; and for services, materials, and miscellaneous supplies, and contingent expenses in connection with repairs and improvements to Botanic Gardens, under direction of the Joint Library Committee of Congress, \$8,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Executive," on page 30, line 7, after the word "clerks," to insert "2 at \$2,500 each"; in line 8, before the words "of class 4," to strike out "six" and insert "four"; and in line 11, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$73,440" and insert "\$74,840," so as to make the clause read:

Office of the President: Secretary, \$7,500; executive clerk, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$4,000; appointment clerk, \$3,500; record clerk, \$2,500; 2 expert stenographers, at \$2,500 each; accountant, \$2,500; 2 correspondents, at \$2,500 each; disbursing clerk, \$2,000; clerks—2 at \$2,500 each; 3 at \$2,000 each, 4 of class 4, 3 of class 3, 4 of class 2, 3 of class 1; messengers—2 at \$900 each, 2 at \$840 each; 3 laborers, at \$720 each; in all, \$74,840: *Provided*, That employees of the executive departments and other establishments of the executive branch of the Government may be detailed from time to time to the office of the President of the United States for such temporary assistance as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 20, to insert:

For such expenses as, in the opinion of the President, are properly connected with the formal and official opening of the Panama Canal and each and every purpose connected therewith, \$160,000, to be immediately available, to be expended at the discretion of the President and accounted for on his certificate solely. The President is authorized to utilize the services of such officers of the Army and Navy as he may designate to assist in the formal and official opening of the Panama Canal. The services of the officers of the Army while so employed shall be counted as service with their organizations within the meaning of all laws relating to the detachment of officers from their organizations for duty of any kind. The actual expenses of officers of the Army and Navy while on such duty shall be paid them in lieu of any mileage allowance to which they may be entitled by law. The President is authorized to use such vessels of the United States Army transport service and of the Panama Railroad for the purposes indicated herein as in his opinion can properly be spared, and any expense connected with this use of such vessels shall be payable out of the appropriation herein made, and any vessel not carrying freight-earning cargo used for the purposes indicated herein shall during such use for those purposes be exempt from payment of Panama Canal tolls.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. NORRIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that amendment may be passed over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over in the absence of objection.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Civil Service Commission," on page 33, after line 4, to strike out:

For establishment and maintenance of system of efficiency ratings, \$30,000. The Civil Service Commission shall investigate and report to the President, with its recommendations, as to the administrative needs of the service relating to personnel in the several executive departments and independent establishments in the District of Columbia, and report to Congress details of expenditure and of progress of work hereunder at the beginning of each regular session: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a compensation in excess of \$4,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 14, to insert:

For maintenance of system of efficiency ratings, \$40,000. The Civil Service Commission shall investigate and report to the President, with its recommendations, as to the administrative needs of the service relating to personnel in the several executive departments and independent establishments in the District of Columbia, and report to Congress at the beginning of each regular session details of expenditure and of progress of work hereunder, including investigation of duplication of statistical and other work in the various branches of the Government service: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a compensation in excess of \$4,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of State," in the item of appropriation for salary of Secretary of State, etc., on page 35, line 14, before the word "messengers," to strike out "five" and insert "six"; in the same line, before the word "assistant," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty-four"; in line 17, after the word "operator," to insert "driver, \$840; hostler, \$720"; and in line 18, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$320,000" and insert "\$321,740," so as to read:

Chief messenger, \$1,000; 6 messengers; 24 assistant messengers; messenger boy, \$420; packer, \$720; 4 laborers, at \$600 each; telephone switchboard operator; assistant telephone switchboard operator; driver, \$840; hostler, \$720; in all, \$321,740.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 18, to insert:
For emergency clerical services, to be expended by the Secretary of State in his discretion, \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. Can we have a little explanation of what that item is for? It proposes to appropriate \$30,000 for emergency clerical services. I am not objecting to it, but I simply would like to be informed why it is desired.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The State Department estimated for that and was very insistent that it was necessary. The department wanted \$75,000 instead of \$30,000, but the committee provided for only \$30,000.

Mr. KENYON. The request from the Secretary of State was for \$75,000?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It was.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator have the letter of the Secretary read? That, I think, will explain it in detail.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia (reading)—

I am constrained to ask and earnestly and sincerely urge that the bill be so amended in the Senate as to provide a lump-sum appropriation of \$75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the continuance of such temporary force during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, in order to adequately and properly perform the duties devolving upon this department.

It is a long letter. I think that covers that feature, though.

Mr. KENYON. Is there anything showing the number to be employed?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No. It is a fund that is to be disbursed as the necessities may require, in accordance with the judgment of the Secretary of State. If the Senator desires it, the entire letter can be read. It is a long letter, however—four or five pages in length.

Mr. KENYON. I wish we might have a little more information about it. May we have the letter read? Would there be any objection to that?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No; I have no objection whatever.

Mr. KENYON. I ask, then, that the Secretary read the letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the letter.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 22, 1914.

The Hon. THOMAS S. MARTIN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: In submitting its estimates for the support of the Department of State for the ensuing fiscal year, earnest desire was expressed for slight increases in the permanent force assigned to this department. These increases were submitted to and approved by the President, who realized the necessity for them. Owing to the present disturbed conditions in Europe, which affect the entire world, a great additional burden of work and responsibility has been imposed upon both the technical and clerical force of the Department of State. The volume of this work has increased 300 per cent since the 1st of August, and the numerous and intricate questions growing out of the European situation bid fair to continue this increased work for an indefinite period. Only because of the appropriation for the relief of American citizens abroad has it been possible, through the employment of a temporary force, to keep up the immense volume of work with which this department has had to deal. This temporary force, of course, is of limited tenure, and no provision is made for its employment beyond the present fiscal year. With the Department of State looking after the diplomatic interests of the greater part of Europe, and with no end to the present European struggle in sight, it seems imperative that ample provision be made for the extra clerical force necessary for the department to properly and adequately perform its duties. These facts were fully set forth to the House Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the legislative bill, but apparently to no avail, as the bill has already passed the House carrying no provisions whatever for any increase in the clerical force or any provision for the temporary force. In view of these facts, I am constrained to ask and earnestly and sincerely urge that the bill be so amended in the Senate as to provide a lump-sum appropriation of \$75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the continuance of such temporary force during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, in order to adequately and properly perform the duties devolving upon this department.

I beg further to invite your attention to the request contained in the annual estimates of the modest increase in the appropriation for rental of buildings occupied by the Department of State, in order that the outlying bureaus of the department may be brought together and housed in a conveniently located building. The quarters assigned to the State Department in the State, War, and Navy Building have long since been outgrown. They are crowded to the limit and several important bureaus have been forced to take up quarters in two outlying, widely separated, and inadequately arranged buildings. It is believed that for a rental of not exceeding \$15,000 a modern office building conveniently adapted to the needs of the department will be erected by private parties immediately across the street from the entrance to the Department of State, and will provide for almost as convenient quarters as though housed in the department building proper. The present scattered condition of the bureaus of the department not only renders efficient administrative work impossible, but is a source of constant irritation to numerous callers, including Senators and Representatives, who, upon calling at the department, often find that they must be referred to buildings located some distance away. The present rent paid by the department amounts to \$11,200 per annum. The buildings occupied for which this rental is paid give an available floor space of 13,000 square feet. The proposed new building will afford an estimated

available floor space of 16,000 feet, much more conveniently arranged, and much better adapted for efficient administration. It is believed that in this building can also be accommodated the several commissions associated with the Department of State, for which an annual rental of \$5,200 additional to the \$11,200 above mentioned is paid. The provision of \$15,000 would therefore present an actual saving in the rental expenditure for the coming fiscal year.

I have also the honor to invite your attention to the fact that for the past 10 years, under the authority provided in the appropriations "For the purchase, care, and subsistence of horses," we employed a stableman for the care of horses, at a monthly salary of \$55. The disbursing clerk of this department has recently been notified by the Comptroller of the Treasury that this expenditure will be no longer allowed unless the employment is specifically provided for. This matter should therefore be remedied in the appropriations for the coming year.

I beg further to call your attention to the case of Mr. John Barry, who has been the driver for the Secretaries of State for the past 35 years. Mr. Barry is carried upon the department's rolls as an assistant messenger at a salary of \$60 per month. He is a most efficient, capable, and careful man. I understand that the carriage drivers of the other Cabinet members receive much higher salaries than Mr. Barry, and I earnestly recommend, in view of his long and faithful services, that he be specifically provided for.

I therefore have the honor to request that your committee amend the bill as it affects the provisions for the Department of State providing for the matters above presented as follows:

After line 9, on page 33, insert the following: "For emergency clerical service, to be expended by the Secretary of State, in his discretion, \$75,000, or so much thereof as may be required."

Strike out lines 24 and 25, on page 33, and insert: "For rent of buildings in the District of Columbia for the Department of State, \$15,000; the Secretary of State is hereby authorized, in his judgment, to enter into a lease for a period of five years for the occupancy of a suitable building, in close proximity to the Department of State, for the housing of all outlying bureaus and offices of the department: *Provided*, The annual rental thereof shall not exceed the sum herein appropriated, any unexpended amount thereof to be available for heat and power connections with the State, War, and Navy Building."

After line 23, on page 33, insert the following: "One driver at \$900 and one stableman at \$720."

Every effort has been made to keep the required expenditures in the Department of State to the lowest possible limit, but it seems imperative, in view of the vastly increased amount of highly important work which the department is required to handle, and which bids fair to constantly increase as long, at least, as the present conditions continue in Europe, that the amounts herein requested are vital and necessary. I earnestly and urgently request the favorable consideration of your committee of the matters herein presented.

Very truly yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to inquire if Mr. Barry has been taken care of in the bill. I notice that the salary of the driver is placed at \$840. I assume that that is Mr. Barry. Has he been taken care of?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. He has. That has been provided for. This \$30,000 is all that we gave of the \$75,000 asked. I will say that it was my personal judgment that the Secretary ought to have had \$75,000, but the subcommittee did not take that view, nor did the full committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," in the item of appropriation for Office of the Secretary, on page 37, line 22, after "\$1,100," to insert "assistant painter, \$900"; on page 38, line 9, after the word "each," to strike out "skilled laborer, \$840" and insert "carpenter, \$900; wireman, \$900"; and in line 10, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$485,980" and insert "\$187,840"; so as to read:

Painter, \$1,100; assistant painter, \$900; plumber's assistant, \$780; 85 charwomen; carpenters—two at \$1,000 each, one \$720. Winder Building: Engineer, \$1,000; three firemen; elevator conductor, \$720; four watchmen; three laborers (one of whom, when necessary, shall assist and relieve the elevator conductor); forewoman of char force, \$480; eight charwomen. Cox Building, 1709 New York Avenue: Two watchmen-firemen, at \$720 each; laborer. Auditors' Building: Forewoman of char force, \$480; 25 charwomen; elevator conductor, \$720; five laborers, at \$500 each (one of whom, when necessary, shall assist and relieve the elevator conductor); two female laborers, at \$480 each; carpenter, \$900; wireman, \$900; in all, \$187,840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 2, to strike out:

Division of Revenue-Cutter Service: Assistant chief of division, \$2,400; chief clerk, \$2,000; law and contract clerk, \$1,800, and \$200 additional while the office is held by the present incumbent; clerks—one of class 4, four of class 3, one of class 2, three of class 1, four at \$1,000 each, three at \$900 each; messenger; laborer; in all, \$27,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 9, to strike out:

The services of skilled draftsmen, and such other technical services as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary, may be employed only in the Division of Revenue-Cutter Service in connection with the construction and repair of revenue cutters, to be paid from the appropriation "Repairs to revenue cutters": *Provided*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1916 shall not exceed \$3,400. A statement of the persons employed hereunder, their duties, and the compensation paid to each shall be made to Congress each year in the annual estimates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 1, before the word "laborers," to strike out "two" and insert "three," and, in line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$32,520" and insert "\$33,180," so as to make the clause read:

Division of Printing and Stationery: Chief of division, \$2,500; assistant chief of division, \$2,000; clerks—4 of class 4, 3 of class 3, 3 of class 2, 3 of class 1, 1 at \$1,000, 1 at \$900; bookbinder, \$1,400; 3 messengers; assistant messenger; 3 laborers; messenger boy, \$360; in all, \$33,180.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 22, to insert:

For law books, including their exchange, to be expended under the direction of the Comptroller of the Treasury, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 22, before the words "of class four," to strike out "ten" and insert "eleven"; in line 23, before the words "of class three," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "sixteen"; in the same line, after the words "of class three," to strike out "sixteen" and insert "seventeen"; and, on page 49, line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$153,780" and insert "\$158,580," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Comptroller of the Currency: Comptroller, \$5,000; deputy comptrollers—1 at \$3,500, 1 at \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; chiefs of division—1 at \$2,500, 2 at \$2,200 each; general bookkeeper, \$2,000; assistant bookkeeper, \$2,000; clerks—11 of class 4, additional to bond clerk \$200, 16 of class 3, 17 of class 2, 26 of class 1, 13 at \$1,000 each, 7 at \$900 each; stenographer, \$1,600; 6 counters, at \$840 each; messenger; 5 assistant messengers; 3 laborers; 2 messenger boys, at \$360 each; in all, \$158,580.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 15, to insert:

For the following employees in the Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue from July 1, 1915, to December 31, 1915, both dates inclusive: Clerks—2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 1 of class 2, 1 of class 1, 1 at \$900; 2 counters, at \$900 each; in all, \$6,050.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 51, to strike out:

Office of Life-Saving Service: General Superintendent, \$4,000, and \$500 additional while the office is held by the present incumbent; assistant general superintendent, \$2,500; principal clerk, \$2,000; title and contract clerk, \$2,000; topographer and hydrographer, \$1,800; civil engineer, \$2,250; draftsman, \$1,500; clerks—3 of class 4, 5 of class 3, 4 of class 2, 5 of class 1, 3 at \$1,000 each, 2 at \$900 each; messenger; assistant messenger; laborer; in all, \$48,570.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, after line 9, to insert:

Office of the Coast Guard: Two chiefs of division, at \$3,000 each; 2 assistant chiefs of division, at \$2,200 each; title and contract clerk, \$2,000; law and contract clerk, \$1,800 and \$200 additional while the office is held by the present incumbent; topographer and hydrographer, \$1,800; civil engineer, \$2,250; draftsman, \$1,500; clerks—4 of class 4, 9 of class 3, 5 of class 2, 8 of class 1, 7 at \$1,000 each, 5 at \$900 each; 2 messengers; assistant messenger; 2 laborers; in all, \$73,370.

The services of skilled draftsmen, and such other technical services as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary, may be employed only in the office of the Coast Guard in connection with the construction and repair of Coast Guard cutters, to be paid from the appropriation "Repairs to Coast Guard cutters": *Provided*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1916 shall not exceed \$3,400. A statement of the persons employed hereunder, their duties, and the compensation paid to each, shall be made to Congress each year in the annual estimates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 18, after the words "assay offices," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$30,000," so as to make the clause read:

For freight on bullion and coin, by registered mail or otherwise, between mints and assay offices, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 24, page 54.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 54, lines 23 and 24, I move for the committee to strike out the words "expenses of Revenue-Cutter Service, \$1,600"; and on page 55, line 1, to strike out the words "Life-Saving Service, \$1,000," and insert in lieu thereof "expenses of the Coast Guard, \$2,600." These offices have been combined, and the appropriations embraced within the proposed amendments do not take any more money but make the bill conform to the law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 56, line 10, after the word "only," to strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$3,500," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase, exchange, maintenance, and repair of motor trucks; purchase, exchange, and maintenance of horses, including shoeing; and the purchase and repair of wagons, horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, and harness, all to be used for official purposes only, \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for washing and hemming towels, etc., on page 57, line 6, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "\$250" and insert "\$300," so as to read:

Sharpening tools, street car tickets not exceeding \$300, advertising for proposals, and for sales at public auction in Washington, D. C., of

condemned property belonging to the Treasury Department, payment of auctioneer fees, and purchase of other absolutely necessary articles, \$13,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 17, to insert:

For shelving and transferring records and files from and to the Treasury Building and its annexes in Washington, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 13, after the word "Service," to strike out "\$400" and insert "\$750," so as to make the clause read:

For heat, light, and shelving for premises No. 1414 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., occupied by the purveying depot of the Public Health Service, \$750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Collecting internal revenue," on page 59, line 12, after the words "internal-revenue offices," to strike out "\$2,165,000" and insert "\$2,480,000," so as to read:

For salaries and expenses of collectors of internal revenue, deputy collectors, surveyors, clerks, messengers, and janitors in internal-revenue offices, \$2,480,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 24 on page 59.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On behalf of the committee, on page 59, line 24, I move to strike out "\$2,600,000" and to insert "\$2,500,000," so as to read:

For salaries and expenses of 40 revenue agents provided for by law, including per diem not to exceed \$4, in lieu of subsistence pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, and fees and expenses of gaugers, salaries and expenses of storekeepers and storekeeper-gaugers, \$2,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 18 on page 60.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to offer the following amendment, to come in on page 60, after line 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 60, after line 18, insert:

Restricting the sale of opium, etc.: For expenses to enforce the provisions of the act approved December 17, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," including the employment of agents, deputy collectors, inspectors, chemists, assistant chemists, clerks, and messengers in the field and in the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the District of Columbia, to be appointed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and for the purchase of such supplies, equipment, mechanical devices, and other articles as may be necessary for use in the District of Columbia and the several collection districts, including not to exceed \$4 per diem in lieu of subsistence to employees while officially engaged away from their designated posts of duty, being for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, \$292,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 5, on page 61.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. On page 61, line 5, I move to strike out "\$90,000" and insert "\$100,000," so as to read:

For rent of offices outside of the District of Columbia, telephone service, and other miscellaneous expenses incident to the collection of internal revenue, purchase of necessary books of reference and periodicals for the chemical laboratory and law library, not to exceed \$500, and reasonable expenses for not exceeding 60 days immediately following the injury of field officers or employees in the Internal Revenue Service while in line of duty, of medical attendance, surgeon's and hospital bills made necessary by reason of such injury, and for horses crippled or killed while being used by officers in making raids, not exceeding \$150 for any horse so crippled or killed, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Mints and assay offices," on page 68, line 6, after the word "melting," to strike out "chief clerk and cashier," and in line 7, after "\$1,800," to insert "chief clerk, who shall also perform the duties of cashier, \$1,200; in all, \$3,000," so as to make the clause read:

Assay office at Salt Lake City, Utah: Assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, \$1,800; chief clerk, who shall also perform the duties of cashier, \$1,200; in all, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for assay office at Salt Lake City, on page 68, line 9, after the word "employees," to strike out "\$1,500" and insert "\$2,000," so as to make the clause read:

For wages of workmen, and other employees, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for assay office at Salt Lake City, on page 68, line 11, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$500" and insert "\$1,000," so as to make the clause read:

For incidental and contingent expenses, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Public Buildings and Grounds," on page 77, line 17, after the word "park," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police," so as to make the clause read:

For sergeant of park police, \$950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 18, after the word "park," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police," so as to make the clause read:

For second sergeant of park police, \$900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 19, after the word "day," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "privates of park police," so as to read:

For day privates of park police, as follows: One in Franklin Park and adjacent reservations on New York Avenue; one in Lafayette Park, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 10, after the word "night," to strike out "watchmen," and insert "privates of park police," so as to make the clause read:

For night privates of park police, as follows: Two in Smithsonian Grounds and neighboring reservations, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 6, after the word "park," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police"; and, in the same line, after the word "ammunition," to strike out "\$400" and insert "\$1,000," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase and repair of bicycles and revolvers for park police and for purchase of ammunition, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 9, after the word "bridge," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police," so as to make the clause read:

For purchasing and supplying uniforms to park, Monument, and bridge police, \$2,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Navy Department," on page 81, after line 8, to strike out:

Library: Clerks—1 of class 2, 1 of class 1; assistant messenger; laborer; in all, \$3,980.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 10, to strike out:

Office of Naval Records of the Rebellion: Chief clerk, \$2,000; agent, to be selected by the Secretary of the Navy from the officers of the late Confederate Navy, \$1,800; clerks—1 of class 4, 3 of class 2, 3 of class 1, 2 at \$1,000 each; copyist, \$720; assistant messenger; necessary traveling expenses for collection of records, \$100; in all, \$17,840. All employees provided for by this paragraph shall be exclusively engaged on the work of this office during the fiscal year 1916.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 20, to insert:

Office of Naval Records and Library: Chief clerk, \$2,000; clerks—2 of class 4, one to be selected from officers of the Confederate Navy (agent for collection of Confederate records); 4 of class 2, 4 of class 1, 2 at \$1,000 each; copyist, \$720; assistant messenger; laborer; necessary traveling expenses for collection of records, \$100; in all, \$21,100. All employees provided for by this paragraph shall be exclusively engaged on the work of this office during the fiscal year 1916.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the Nautical Almanac Office, on page 86, line 24, before the words "one \$2,000," to insert "one \$2,200"; in the same line, after the words "one \$2,000," to insert "one \$1,800"; and on page 87, line 2, after the words "in all," strike out "\$15,640" and insert "\$19,640," so as to make the clause read:

Nautical Almanac Office: For assistants in preparing for publication the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac—one \$2,200, one \$2,000, one \$1,800, two at \$1,600 each, two at \$1,400 each, three at \$1,200 each, two at \$1,000 each; copyist and typewriter, \$900; assistant messenger; messenger boy, \$420; in all, \$19,640.

Mr. JONES. With reference to the first amendment and also the one following, "one \$1,800," as the chairman of the committee knows I am very strongly opposed to those amendments; but in the interest of time I do not want to present the matter that I have gotten, and, furthermore, I do not want to do anything that will interfere with the proper conduct of that office. So I ask the chairman if he would not be willing to reject the first amendment and provide for two clerks at \$1,800. If that would be satisfactory to the chairman of the committee, it would be agreed to by me.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, in the interest of economy of time, I will try to make the bill as acceptable as possible, and I am willing that that amendment shall be made; but if when the bill goes to conference any good reason can be shown against it, while I will insist on it myself, the Senator must understand it may be very difficult to retain it.

Mr. JONES. I want to suggest to the Senator that, of course, it will not be proper in conference to restore the one at \$2,200, but the question would be whether to retain two at \$1,800. I would not care if they are both rejected. We would save that much and not cripple the office, in my judgment.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have no objection to the amendment the Senator suggests.

Mr. JONES. I ask that the first amendment be rejected, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington moves to amend the amendment of the committee, on page 86, line 24, by striking out "one, \$1,800" and inserting "two, \$1,800 each."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that the clerks be authorized to change the totals throughout the bill where it may be necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that action will be taken.

Mr. JONES. I simply want to say in connection with these amendments that I hope the people in the Nautical Almanac Office, when they get these two additional officers, if they do, will see if they can not carry on the office all right with them. I am satisfied they can do it. I have facts and data here that I intended to present, but I will not do it now. I will expect them to take care of the office with those two additional assistants. There are matters that ought to be investigated, but if an attempt is made to correct abuses in the office, adopt efficient methods, and not seek to punish or humiliate those who would assist in doing effective work, I shall be satisfied. Unless better methods are followed, the Nautical Almanac Office should be transferred to another department.

The reading of the bill was continued. The next amendment was, on page 91, line 15, after "\$1,100," to strike out "one, \$1,000" and insert "three, at \$1,000 each," and in line 16, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$8,100" and insert "\$10,100," so as to make the clause read:

Division of Naval Militia Affairs: For the following, authorized by section 17 of the Naval Militia act approved February 16, 1914: Chief clerk, \$1,600; clerks—1 of class 2, 2 of class 1, 1 \$1,100, 3 at \$1,000 each; messenger boy, \$600; in all, \$10,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of the Interior," on page 94, line 11, before the word "Building," to strike out "Old Post Office Department" and insert "General Land Office," so as to make the clause read:

General Land Office Building: Engineer and electrician, \$1,600; assistant engineer, \$1,000; 4 firemen; 3 watchmen, acting as lieutenants, at \$840 each; 20 watchmen; elevator conductor, \$720; 14 laborers; 9 laborers, at \$480 each; 3 skilled mechanics (painter, carpenter, and plumber), at \$900 each; in all, \$39,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for General Land Office, on page 96, line 10, after "\$2,000," to insert "who may, with the approval of the commissioner, designate a clerk of the General Land Office to act as such depositary in his absence," so as to read:

Depositary acting for the commissioner as receiver of public moneys, \$2,000, who may, with the approval of the commissioner, designate a clerk of the General Land Office to act as such depositary in his absence; clerk and librarian, \$1,000; in all, \$631,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 18, after the word "telegrams," to strike out "\$85,000" and insert "\$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

For per diem at not exceeding \$3 in lieu of subsistence pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, for persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions, detailed for the purpose of making special investigations pertaining to said bureau and for actual and other necessary expenses, including telegrams, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, after line 19, to insert: For the purchase of law and reference books, including their exchange, for the general library of the Pension Bureau, \$200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 100, to insert: The sum of \$750, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the \$6,000 appropriated for miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Pensions, in the legislative, executive, and judicial act for the fiscal year 1915, is made available for constructing a fireproof and waterproof vault for the use of the disbursing office, Bureau of Pensions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, after line 7, to insert: For special and temporary services of typewriters certified by the Civil Service Commission, who may be employed in such numbers at

\$2.50 per diem as may, in the judgment of the Commissioner of Patents, be necessary to keep current the work of furnishing manuscript copies of records, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, line 17, after the word "Governments," to strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$3,000," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase of professional and other reference books and publications and scientific books and expense of transporting publications of patents issued by the Patent Office to foreign Governments, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, after line 17, to strike out:

For purchase of law and other reference books, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Offices of surveyors general," on page 106, line 14, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$2,900," and in line 15, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$15,500" and insert "\$15,900," so as to make the clause read:

Alaska: Surveyor general and ex officio secretary of the Territory, \$4,000; clerks, \$9,000; contingent expenses, \$2,900; in all, \$15,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 16, after the word "clerks," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$13,000," and in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$14,500" and insert "\$17,500," so as to make the clause read:

Arizona: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$13,000; contingent expenses, \$1,500; in all, \$17,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 13, after the word "clerks," to strike out "\$8,000" and insert "\$11,000," and in line 14, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$12,500" and insert "\$15,500," so as to make the clause read:

Washington: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$11,000; contingent expenses, \$1,500; in all, \$15,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 16, after the word "clerks," to strike out "\$12,500" and insert "\$18,500"; in line 17, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$500" and insert "\$600"; and in the same line, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$16,000" and insert "\$22,100," so as to make the clause read:

Wyoming: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$18,500; contingent expenses, \$600; in all, \$22,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 108, line 3, after the words "may require," to insert "and to pay their actual necessary traveling expenses in going to and returning from such office out of the appropriation for surveying the public lands," so as to make the clause read:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to detail temporarily clerks from the office of one surveyor general to another as the necessities of the service may require and to pay their actual necessary traveling expenses in going to and returning from such office out of the appropriation for surveying the public lands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Post Office Department," on page 114, line 12, before the words "of class 3," to strike out "34" and insert "31"; in line 13, before the words "of class 2," to strike out "50" and insert "47"; in line 15, before the words "of class 1," to strike out "62" and insert "59"; in line 17, before the words "at \$1,000 each," to strike out "40" and insert "42"; in line 18, before the words "at \$900 each," to strike out "21" and insert "23," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Third Assistant Postmaster General: Third Assistant Postmaster General, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; division of stamps—superintendent \$2,750; division of finance—superintendent (who shall give bond in such amount as the Postmaster General may determine for the faithful discharge of his duties) \$2,250; division of classification—superintendent \$2,750; division of registered mails—superintendent \$2,500; division of money orders—superintendent \$2,750, chief clerk \$2,250; clerks—19 of class 4, 31 of class 3 (2 transferred from Postmaster General's office), 47 of class 2 (1 transferred to Postmaster General's office), 59 of class 1 (2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 1 to Postmaster General's office), 42 at \$1,000 each (2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office), 23 at \$900 each (1 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 114, line 20, before the words "two messengers," to insert "4 at \$720 each."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask the Senate to disagree to the amendment of the committee, which inserts "4 at \$720 each."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. On the same page, in line 20, after the word "messengers," I move to insert "4 assistant messengers."

Mr. OWEN. At what rate?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The statute fixes what assistant messengers shall receive.

Mr. OWEN. How much is that?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Seven hundred and twenty dollars.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 114, line 20, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$316,330" and insert "\$310,410."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 115, line 13, before the word "Division," to strike out "assistant superintendents"; in line 15, after the words "Postal Service," to insert "Division of Dead Letters—superintendent \$2,500," so as to read:

Office Fourth Assistant Postmaster General: Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; Division of Rural Mails—superintendent \$3,000, assistant superintendent \$2,000, chief clerk \$2,000; Division of Supplies—superintendent \$2,750, assistant superintendent \$2,500; Division of Equipment—superintendent \$2,750, chief clerk \$2,000 (transferred from appropriation "Labor, mail-bag repair shop, Postal Service"); Division of Dead Letters—superintendent \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for "Office Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," on page 116, line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$395,060" and insert "\$397,560," so as to read:

Twenty-eight laborers (2 transferred to Postmaster General's office); 3 female laborers, at \$480 each (2 transferred to Postmaster General's office); in all \$397,560.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Justice," on page 119, line 18, after the word "department," to insert "including their exchange," so as to make the clause read:

For books for law library of the department, including their exchange, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Commerce," in the item of appropriation for the office of the Secretary, on page 121, line 25, after the word "each," to strike out "2 firemen, at \$660 each (1 fireman transferred from Census Office)" and insert "3 firemen (1 transferred from Census Office)"; and on page 122, line 6, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$170,360" and insert "\$170,480," so as to read:

Three elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 3 firemen (1 transferred from Census Office); 13 laborers; 2 laborers, at \$480 each; cabinet-maker, \$1,000; carpenter, \$900; chief watchman, \$900; 10 watchmen (2 transferred from Census Office); 25 charwomen (5 transferred from Census Office); in all, \$170,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 123, line 17, after the words "per day," to strike out "\$552,300" and insert "\$512,000, \$150,000 of said sum to be immediately available for the completion of the canvass of manufacturing establishments," so as to make the clause read:

For securing information for census reports, provided for by law, semi-monthly reports of cotton production, periodical report of stocks of baled cotton in the United States and of domestic and foreign consumption of cotton; per diem compensation of special agents and expenses of same and of detailed employees, whether employed in Washington, D. C., or elsewhere; cost of transcribing State, municipal, or other records; temporary rental of quarters outside of the District of Columbia; for supervising agents, and employment by them of such temporary service as may be necessary in collecting statistics required by law: *Provided*, That the compensation of not to exceed five special agents provided for in this paragraph may be fixed at an amount not to exceed \$8 per day, \$512,000, \$150,000 of said sum to be immediately available for the completion of the canvass of manufacturing establishments.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to inquire what that item is—" \$150,000 of said sum to be immediately available for the completion of the canvass of manufacturing establishments." When was that authorized by law?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will try and find it for the Senator, but it is provided for by law. It is an appropriation in accordance with law, and this \$150,000 made available immediately enables the Director of the Census to reduce the appropriation from \$552,000 to \$512,000, because it will enable him to carry on the work continuously and economically instead of irregularly.

Mr. BURTON. Is this appropriation of \$150,000 in the nature of a deficiency appropriation or is it an annual appropriation?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is a part of the appropriation for the year 1916. It is not a deficiency, but it is taken from the \$512,000; it is made available immediately to enable the work to go along continuously and economically, and it will

enable the Director of the Census to reduce the aggregate appropriation from \$552,000 to \$512,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the appropriation for last year was not sufficient to carry on the work to the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915. In order that the work may continue right along, \$150,000 of this amount for the coming fiscal year is now made available for the work for which they anticipated they would have appropriations in the last appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator from Ohio desires it, I can have the letter from the Census Bureau read.

Mr. SMOOT. It had better be read.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is not in any sense a deficiency, but by being made immediately available it will effect an economy in the service.

Mr. BURTON. Before the letter is read I should like to ask, What is this "cavass of manufacturing establishments"?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is a census of manufacturing establishments. It is a regular branch of the census work.

Mr. BURTON. In the usual form, giving the number of establishments, the capital, employees, wages, raw material, and finished product?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is a complete census of general industries, as I understand, as provided for by law.

Mr. BURTON. When was that authorized?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I can not immediately lay my hand on the statute which is now in force, and which provides for this census, but I know there is such a statute.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that it was provided for in the legislative bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

Mr. BURTON. What is the total cost of this census?

Mr. SMOOT. I forget exactly the amount of the appropriation, but I will say to the Senator that whatever the amount of the appropriation, it is not sufficient to carry on the work to the end of this year.

Mr. BURTON. There has been a census every five years of manufacturing establishments?

Mr. SMOOT. This is not the particular census of which the Senator speaks; this is the census which was provided for by the appropriation for the taking of the census of manufactures. There is, however, an appropriation made other than this for the general census of the United States. This has nothing whatever to do with that.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. In the statement prepared by the Director of the Census I find this, which will probably answer the question of the Senator from Ohio:

There has been appropriated and set aside for the census of manufactures of 1914, \$470,000, to be expended for field work during the fiscal year. It has also been estimated that the office work during the year ending June 30, 1915, on this branch of the census would amount to approximately \$380,000, making a total expenditure for the present fiscal year of \$850,000.

Of course, the addition of \$150,000 would make it an even million dollars. As I understand, that will complete the census of manufactures.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida permit me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. When is the result of this investigation to be promulgated—immediately upon its completion?

Mr. BRYAN. According to this statement, that is the purpose; it is not to be postponed.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is not for the purpose of the next census, is it?

Mr. BRYAN. No; as I understand, the Director of the Census states that he will be able to publish it shortly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, this is, to my mind, an illustration of the tremendous waste of money which we are making in this country by these investigations at great cost. They are practically out of date when we get their results. The census of the manufacturing establishments this year would not give us any information next year, nor would they have much relation to the condition of things the year before. If they are printed and promulgated, however, immediately upon completion, they ought to be completed as speedily as possible.

I presume that this is good work, valuable work, and I do not oppose it; but I have been interested in noticing the investigations by the Department of Labor. They send out their agents all over the country to ascertain the wages, the number of employees, and all that, and by the time we get the information in print, the whole condition has changed. Not only that, but they

are duplicating that kind of work in several of the departments. I think the whole thing ought to be very carefully looked into with a view of practicing not only economy but common sense in such matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BURTON. The letter was to be read, I believe, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the letter.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, February 2, 1915.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Confirming our conversation of yesterday, I desire to request that you have the bill (H. R. 19900) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, amended as follows: On page 119, after line 2, and in lieu of the word "Provided," on line 3, insert the following:

"Provided, That of the amount appropriated by this paragraph the sum of \$150,000 shall be immediately available for the completion of the canvass of manufacturing establishments."

You will please note that I have reduced the total amount of the appropriation for collecting statistics from \$552,300 to \$512,000, which is a decrease of \$40,300 in the amount allowed by the House. I am willing to drop \$40,300 of the appropriation for taking the census of manufactures if I can get \$150,000 of the total made available at the time the bill becomes a law. I am asking that this be done in order that I may have sufficient money to push the canvass and complete my field work by June 30, 1915. It is my intention, if this money is made available, to finish the field canvass earlier than it has ever been done before and to publish the final results several months in advance of the publication of any preceding census of manufactures.

If this money is not made available immediately upon the passage of the bill, I very much fear that my appropriation will be expended before the close of the fiscal year. If this should happen, it would place the bureau in a very embarrassing position, as the canvass of the manufacturing establishments would have to be abandoned until the appropriation for the next fiscal year became available. The bureau will have a large number of clerks and special agents in the field in connection with this canvass, and if the appropriation should be exhausted it would be necessary to return them to the office here or to their respective homes, and later send them into the field again at very heavy expense to the bureau. By having \$150,000 available before the end of this fiscal year, a contingency of this kind would be prevented.

Very truly, yours,

WM. J. HARRIS,
Director.

HON. THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to ask one question. Who are these five special agents provided for in this paragraph? Where are those provided for? In a hasty reading I am unable to see where provision is made for them.

Mr. SMOOT. They will be paid out of the lump sum.

Mr. BURTON. I know, but this provision reads:

Provided, That the compensation of not to exceed five special agents provided for in this paragraph may be fixed at an amount not to exceed \$8 per day.

Mr. SMOOT. They are to be paid out of the lump sum.

Mr. BURTON. I know that; but who are the "five special agents provided for in this paragraph"? How are they chosen? Are they under the civil service?

Mr. SMOOT. I should say they are not. I should say they would be appointed by the Director of the Census as soon as the \$150,000 appropriation is available or upon the passage of the bill.

Mr. BURTON. That seems to have been in the bill before. Provision is made that \$150,000 is to be immediately available.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think these five special agents are under the civil service. Though the Director of the Census does appoint special agents at three or four dollars a day for special work, there are five or six men who are under civil service. I know that. I know nothing about these five special agents, however.

Mr. BURTON. There is some confusion here. I did not understand the statement of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. OVERMAN. I said these five special agents were under civil service, but the Director of the Census does appoint a great many agents who are provided for special work.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I will say to the Senator that I am quite sure these special agents are not under civil service. The five special agents who will be appointed by the Director of the Census, I have no doubt, will be paid out of the sum provided for by this appropriation.

Mr. GALLINGER. The probability is, Mr. President, that the House of Representatives copied the phraseology of the bill of last year, because these five special agents are not provided for in this paragraph, so far as I can find, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has called attention to the same thing. I think the words "provided for in this paragraph" ought to be stricken out. They can be restored in conference if they ought

not to be out, and I move to strike out the words "provided for in this paragraph."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 123, line 16, it is proposed to strike out the words "provided for in this paragraph."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply want to call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the fact that in that paragraph he will notice, beginning at the end of line 7, this language:

Per diem compensation of special agents and expenses of same and of detailed employees—

I think it is to that language the phrase "provided for in this paragraph" refers; but as to the five special agents, they could not be paid to exceed \$8 per day. I think, therefore, those words should not be stricken out.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, let the vote whereby my amendment was agreed to be reconsidered. I think the Senator from Utah is right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the vote whereby the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] was agreed to will be reconsidered, and the amendment will be regarded as not agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Well, Mr. President, that is not an authorization to employ special agents. The language in lines 7 and 8 reads:

Per diem compensation of special agents and expenses of same and of detailed employees, whether employed in Washington, D. C., or elsewhere—

That does not seem to imply the creation of any new office. Indeed, so far as it goes, it negatives that idea, because it speaks of "detailed employees," while the words which the Senator from New Hampshire proposed to strike out were "provided for in this paragraph." I do not see any place in the paragraph where there is provision for any special agents.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. This paragraph provides the compensation, but there must be some provision of law somewhere else authorizing the employment. I agree with the Senator from Ohio. I do not see any specific authority here for their appointment, but it does provide for the compensation of special agents.

Mr. BURTON. Under those circumstances, I should be inclined to think, Mr. President, that the proposed amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire was appropriate. At least, I think the language had better go out, and, if necessary, it can be restored in conference. I am especially interested in this paragraph, in knowing whether these appointees are to be outside the civil service.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I can not answer that. I am not very particular whether they are or not. I am not watching for appointments to positions involving a few dollars, and I am very indifferent to that matter one way or the other. I do not think the Government will be wrecked if the Director of the Census has to appoint them; and I do not think that it will be wrecked if he should have to go to the Civil Service Commission for them.

Mr. BURTON. Except, Mr. President, that the whole tendency in the management of the departments and bureaus by this administration has been to wreck the civil service.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Well, Mr. President, I am not going into a discussion of that question, either.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I understood that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire had been withdrawn, but the amendment of the committee has not yet been adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 124, to strike out:

That section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909, is hereby repealed.

And insert:

Census of agriculture: For taking, compiling, and completing the census of agriculture required by section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909, providing for the Thirteenth and subsequent censuses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$2,286,100.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I object to that amendment, and I want to submit a few observations in regard to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, there will be some discussion about that amendment, and I suggest that it be passed over until we get through with the remainder of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 124, line 13, after the word "clerks," to strike out "nine" and insert "ten," and in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$119,280," and insert "\$121,080," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: Chief, \$6,000; assistant chiefs—1 \$3,500, 1 \$3,000; chiefs of divisions—1 \$2,500, 1 \$2,000; assistant chief of division, \$2,250; chief clerk, \$2,250; translator, \$2,000; stenographer to chief of bureau, \$1,600; clerks—10 of class 4, 6 of class 3, 1 \$1,500, 15 of class 2, 14 of class 1, 13 at \$1,000 each (2 transferred to Secretary's office), 14 at \$900 each (1 transferred to Secretary's office); 3 assistant messengers; 2 laborers; in all, \$121,080.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, line 17, after the words "United States," to strike out "and for one clerk to each of said commercial attachés to be paid a salary not to exceed \$1,500 each," and insert "for clerks to commercial attachés," so as to make the clause read:

Commercial attachés: For commercial attachés, to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, after examination to be held under his direction to determine their competency, and to be accredited through the State Department, whose duties shall be to investigate and report upon such conditions in the manufacturing industries and trade of foreign countries as may be of interest to the United States; for clerks to commercial attachés; and for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, rent, purchase of reports, books of reference and periodicals, travel to and from the United States, and all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing; such commercial attachés shall serve directly under the Secretary of Commerce and shall report directly to him, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 127, line 5, after the word "each," to strike out "1 \$900" and insert "3 at \$900 each," and in line 6, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$15,540" and insert "\$17,340," so as to make the clause read:

Steamboat-Inspection Service: Supervising Inspector General, \$4,000; chief clerk and Acting Supervising Inspector General in the absence of that officer, \$2,000; clerks—2 of class 3, 1 of class 2, 1 of class 1, 2 at \$1,000 each, 3 at \$900 each; messenger; in all, \$17,340.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 127, line 16, after the words "New York," to strike out "twenty-seven" and insert "thirty-three"; in line 20, after the name "Milwaukee," to strike out "eight" and insert "two"; in line 22, after "\$2,500," to insert: "Providence, R. I., 2 at \$1,800 each; Cleveland, Ohio, 2 at \$1,600 each; Chicago, Ill., 2 at \$1,600 each; Grand Haven, Mich., 2 at \$1,600; Detroit, Mich., 2 at \$1,600 each; Portland, Oreg., 2 at \$1,600 each"; and, on page 128, line 2, after the word "each," to strike out "\$152,500" and insert "\$174,500," so as to make the clause read:

Assistant inspectors, as authorized by act of April 9, 1906, for the following ports: New York, 33 at \$2,000 each; New Orleans, 4 at \$1,800 each; Baltimore, 6 at \$1,800 each; Boston, 6 at \$1,800 each; Philadelphia, 8 at \$1,800 each; San Francisco, 8 at \$1,800 each; Buffalo, 4 at \$1,600 each; Milwaukee, 2 at \$1,600 each; Norfolk, 4 at \$1,600 each; Seattle, 8 at \$1,600 each; traveling inspector, \$2,500; Providence, R. I., 2 at \$1,800 each; Cleveland, Ohio, 2 at \$1,600 each; Chicago, Ill., 2 at \$1,600 each; Grand Haven, Mich., 2 at \$1,600 each; Detroit, Mich., 2 at \$1,600 each; Portland, Oreg., 2 at \$1,600 each; \$174,500.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I have received quite a number of complaints that the inspection service was so much behind that boats were delayed in beginning the business of the season. I take it this paragraph increases the number of inspectors and seeks to remedy that situation.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator is correct. The number of inspectors is increased for the purpose of making the inspection more prompt and more efficient.

Mr. BURTON. When will this provision go into effect?

Mr. OVERMAN. On July 1.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. On the 1st day of July next.

Mr. BURTON. If the evil exists, it is pressing now, and I will inquire if there is any objection to stating that these amounts shall be immediately available?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It seems to me the time is so near at hand that we can better afford to go along and await the regular course for the law to become operative rather than to make the amounts immediately available.

Mr. BURTON. The provision is in pursuance of the recommendations of the Supervising Inspector and of the Secretary of Commerce, is it not?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is duly recommended and estimated for.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 128, line 3, after the word "Service," to strike out "\$353,600" and insert "\$375,600," so as to make the clause read:

In all, Steamboat-Inspection Service, \$375,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 128, line 25, after "\$80,000," to insert:

Provided, That after the passage of this act the officers and employees of the Steamboat-Inspection Service traveling in Alaska may be allowed, in addition to actual traveling expenses, actual expenses of subsistence not to exceed \$7 per day when authorized by the Secretary of Commerce.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 129, line 12, after "\$1,200," to strike out "Bath, \$1,000"; in line 13, after "\$3,000," to strike out "Gloucester, \$600"; in line 15, before the name "Philadelphia," to strike out "Pascagoula, \$300"; and in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$29,500" and insert "\$27,600," so as to make the clause read:

Shipping service: For shipping commissioners in amounts not exceeding the following: Baltimore, \$1,200; Boston, \$3,000; New Bedford, \$1,200; New Orleans, \$1,500; New York, \$5,000; Norfolk, \$1,500; Philadelphia, \$2,400; Portland, Me., \$1,300; Seattle, \$3,500; Providence, \$1,800; Rockland, \$1,200; San Francisco, \$4,000; in all, \$27,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 135, after line 13, to insert:

For investigation and standardization of methods and instruments employed in radio communication, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 135, after line 18, to insert:

For investigation of the methods of measurement and technical processes in the manufacture of pottery, brick, tile, terra cotta, and other clay products, and the study of the properties of the materials used in that industry, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. There is rather an exceptional provision at the bottom of page 143 and at the top of page 144, reading as follows:

Retired judges: Salaries of judges retired under section 714 of the Revised Statutes, so much as may be necessary for the fiscal year 1916.

No amount is given. Is that one of the continuing appropriations paid out of the Treasury without legislation specifying the amount?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is never made definite. The item is to pay judges who have retired, and that is a varying amount. We might make a specific appropriation now and within 30 days another judge might retire and there would be no provision to pay him. It is an indefinite appropriation, and necessarily so. It is always made in that form and it is entirely free from any injustice or any wrong.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator if it is not a continuing appropriation and paid every year without a direct appropriation being made of a specific amount?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I believe it is customary to make this provision, continuing it every year. It covers a varying class, and the amount can not be fixed without doing injustice to some one.

Mr. BURTON. I am aware, Mr. President, that it is in accordance with law, but I do not see the need of the provision here.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Well, it certainly does not do any harm and, in my judgment, it is necessary.

Mr. BURTON. I do not know that it can do any harm, either.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am quite sure it can not.

Mr. BURTON. But it is a rather singular provision to put in an appropriation bill in the midst of a number of specific appropriations.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The amount expended last year is given in the Book of Estimates, but exactly what it will be another year depends on circumstances which have not yet developed. There may be other judges who will retire whose salaries would have to be paid. At any rate, the provision can not possibly do any harm.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator from Ohio will refer to section 714 of the Revised Statutes, he will see that authorization is made for these payments. That section reads:

SEC. 714. When any judge of any court of the United States resigns his office, after having held his commission as such at least 10 years,

and having attained the age of 70 years, he shall, during the residue of his natural life, receive the same salary which was by law payable to him at the time of his resignation.

I think, therefore, this is a continuing appropriation in accordance with the provisions of law.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The provision is in the usual language; it is in accordance with the rules of the auditing department of the Government, and it is certainly a safe piece of legislation.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Judicial," on page 145, line 4, after the words "law books," to insert "including the exchange thereof," so as to make the clause read:

Books for judicial officers: For purchase and rebinding of law books, including the exchange thereof, for United States judges, district attorneys, and other judicial officers, including the nine libraries of the United States circuit courts of appeals, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General: *Provided*, That such books shall in all cases be transmitted to their successors in office; all books purchased thereunder to be plainly marked, "The property of the United States," \$16,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, the first amendment passed over, I believe, was on page 28, relating to the Library.

Mr. SMOOT. The first one, I think, is on page 5. As I recall, an amendment was passed over in line 17, on page 5, covering the words "one for the majority and one for the minority."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That relates to the experts for the Finance Committee. The Senator is correct. That, however, is a provision in the House text.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] to move to strike out the words "one for the majority and one for the minority, at \$2,000 each."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are some committee amendments which have been passed over.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have called attention to the first committee amendment passed over, on page 28.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I do not think, Mr. President, there was an amendment passed over at the point indicated by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. There was merely notice given that an amendment would be offered at that point.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. An amendment was agreed to there, as I understand, but the Senator from Utah proposed to add to it.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from Virginia has no further committee amendments to offer, when all the committee amendments that have been passed over have been agreed to, I will offer an amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I inquire if the amendment, on page 28, after the figures "\$2,500," in line 6, was agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Now, I will go to page 28. Is that the page?

Mr. SMOOT. The next item is on page 30.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Oh, yes; about the Panama Canal. That was passed over, I think, at the request of the Senator from Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has been read. It was passed over.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the amendment, on page 30, line 21, making an appropriation for the expenses of the formal opening of the Panama Canal. The Senator from Utah asked that that be passed over. It has not yet been adopted.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I have sent word to a Senator who desired to speak upon it. Does the Senator from Idaho desire to discuss it?

Mr. BORAH. I do not care to speak on it. I simply wanted to know if there was any statement before the committee showing what this \$160,000 is for.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There was an informal schedule sent to the committee from the War Department which estimated for an appropriation of \$250,000. In that \$250,000 there was provision made for the President and for representatives of foreign Governments and for administrative officers and officials who have done this great work—engineers like Goethals and all the engineers who have been associated with the work.

There was provision made for them, and there was also provision made for taking a large delegation from Congress. It included about \$100,000. Three ships were to be set aside for the transportation of Members of Congress. The committee thought that scheme ought not to be carried out. They thought Congress ought to be represented, however, and under the provision as it now exists the President will invite a fair representation of both Houses of Congress.

It was my suggestion to the President that we should not undertake to fix the personnel of this committee, but leave it to him. He said he would not like to undertake that duty; and I then suggested that the presiding officers of the two Houses could relieve him of it; that the President of the Senate could designate the Senators and the Speaker of the House designate the Members of the House to make a committee or a representation of the two Houses of Congress on this occasion and the expenses of that committee of the two Houses of Congress have been provided for in this \$160,000. It is largely intended to pay distinguished attention to the South American Republics. The estimate did not go into very great detail, but in a general way it did make out a scheme of the kind I have mentioned.

Mr. BORAH. As I understand, then, a large portion of this \$160,000, or at least a portion of it, is to be used for the purpose of paying the way, the expenses, hotel bills, and so forth, of Members of Congress to attend this exposition?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. On the contrary, Mr. President, an exceedingly small quantity of it is to be so used. The \$100,000 provided for that purpose the committee thought was too large. It did not want any junket. It did not want any large representation from Congress, and we struck out about \$100,000 in order not to permit a thing of that sort. A very small committee is to be selected, in order that the Congress may have official representation on this great occasion; but only a very small part of this \$160,000 will be required to pay that expense. Indeed, it will be paid out of what had been intended for other purposes. They will have to economize in the other purposes I have mentioned in order to make provision for a small representation of the two Houses of Congress.

There is not to be anything like a junket. There is not to be anything like a great occasion for the pleasure of Senators and Congressmen. It is simply to provide for official representation of the two Houses at the formal opening of the canal, and a very small part of this \$160,000 is to be expended for that purpose.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, of course the officials of the other American Republics are to be invited.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They are to be chiefly the objects of attention on this occasion.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator if it was not understood by the committee that none of the Members of the House and none of the Members of the Senate would be asked to accompany the President on this trip, or that if they did they would pay their own expenses?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Unless the President chose to invite a few Members of each House, which I think he contemplates doing, but which he need not do unless he chooses.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought it was distinctly understood that that was not to be the case—that none of the Members of Congress were to be asked.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That was not my understanding.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will state that I was on the subcommittee with the Senator from Utah, and the original idea was this: We at first provided for \$250,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. The idea then was to provide for a large number; but rather than have a scandal about it, or a controversy about it, we struck out \$100,000—

Mr. SMOOT. Ninety thousand dollars.

Mr. OVERMAN. Ninety thousand dollars, which was the estimate for Congress. Now, if the President chooses to invite a few of his friends, I presume he will do so. I do not know whether he will do it or not.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, do I understand that, so far as the intent of the committee is concerned, it has eliminated the entire amount which it was anticipated would be spent for Members of Congress?

Mr. OVERMAN. Exactly—\$90,000.

Mr. BORAH. So there is really no specific provision here, in the mind of the committee, to provide for Congressmen?

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all.

Mr. BORAH. Then whom is it for?

Mr. OVERMAN. The President has a right to invite anybody he pleases. He can leave Congress out.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; that is true; but what I wanted to get at was the intent of the committee, and whether or not the committee was intending to appropriate for congressional representation.

Mr. OVERMAN. The original intention was to put in \$100,000 for Congress; but on account of the fact that there might seem to be a scandal about it in the country we struck that out entirely, and that was the estimate which we did strike out.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say that my understanding was that no Member of Congress would be invited to take this trip at Government expense. It was my understanding, when the estimated appropriation of \$250,000 was first made, that Members of Congress would be invited, but the \$90,000 reduction was made with the understanding that none should be invited. That is how I understood it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have understood from the first that whether the amount was \$250,000 or \$160,000, in either instance it was left for the President to expend this money as he saw fit. There was no direction that any Congressman should go, but I knew by an informal statement sent to me from the department that the scheme for the use of this \$250,000 included the sending of three ships, with about 250 or 300 Members of Congress on board. For my part, I did not approve of that. I did not care whether there was a scandal or not, but I did not think it was wise or just or reasonable to take three shiploads of Congressmen down on this occasion. I did think, however, that there was some fitness in having a few Members of Congress represent the legislative department of the Government on this formal occasion. I understood from the War Department, and I also understood from a conversation with the President, that he would like to have some Members of Congress present on the formal opening of the canal. I told him the committee had determined to strike out this \$90,000 because it did not approve of this great delegation going down there at the expense of the Government. It was said in the conversation, either by him or by myself, that if he wanted to have any Members of Congress present, he could invite them and pay for them out of the \$160,000. He said it would be very embarrassing to him to make the selection of a small committee to be present on this occasion, and I suggested that, if he desired it, I had no doubt the Vice President and the Speaker of the House would assist him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Vice President has no right to take a hand in legislation. The Vice President announces now that he will appoint no Senators. That can be depended upon.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I take it for granted that if the President of the United States should request you to aid him in the selection of a few Members of Congress to go down there, there would be no insuperable objection on your part; but that is a matter with which we are not concerned. We appropriate \$160,000 and put it at the disposal of the President, to be paid out on his order only.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, does the Senator from Virginia think that the Congress has any concern with how this \$160,000 is to be expended?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think it has; and it has done its part when it has put this sum at the disposal of the President of the United States, who is practically to be in charge of its expenditure. He is to invite the diplomats and the rulers of these South American Republics who have taken a deep interest in the Panama Canal, and he wants to extend to them some courtesies on the occasion of this formal opening. It is all put at the disposal of the President of the United States to be used in that way.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I understand from the Senator that there is some tentative scheme of this outlined trip and the expenditure of this money that he has had the good fortune to have presented to him by the War Department, or some other department. I should like to get at the basis upon which this \$160,000 was arrived at. For instance, I heard objections here from certain Members of the Senate to the mileage proposed by the committee for the Senators, and rather some little insistence that the mileage provided by the House should be retained, which as I recall was \$12,700 for mileage for 96 Senators from their homes to attend the sessions of Congress and return. That, as I figured out, roughly speaking, would amount to \$133 apiece. I am perfectly willing to vote the \$250,000 mentioned in the tentative scheme that the Senator speaks of if such an amount is necessary to carry out any legitimate purpose in opening the Panama Canal; but, query: If \$133 apiece, on an average, is sufficient to pay the mileage and all expenses of a Senator in going to and from his home to attend the sessions of the Senate, how much is necessary to pay the expenses of the President of the United States to and from San Francisco, taking into consideration the fact that he is also to be furnished

with transportation, with war vessels, I presume with food, and with sleeping quarters for himself and his entourage, whether that may consist of diplomats, members of the staff of the Army or the Navy, or of Members of Congress. How much per capita is it? How do you arrive at this \$160,000?

As I say, if it is necessary to vote the \$250,000 that was originally asked, I am perfectly willing to vote it; but I should like very much to have the same advantage that the Senator from Virginia has had of an examination of this tentative scheme, to find the basis upon which the amount of \$160,000 or \$250,000 was arrived at, and how much the Senator concluded to strike off, or for what reason he concluded to strike off the arbitrary amount of \$90,000, leaving it at \$160,000 now.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I explained to the Senator that we struck out what had been intended for, transportation and maintenance of Members of Congress. That was \$90,000, and that was stricken from the bill.

Mr. FALL. Exactly. How many Members of Congress was it intended to take upon this trip?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There was no way to fix that. It was estimated, though, that about 250 might be taken, and that it would take about \$90,000 or \$100,000. Of course, there is no way of figuring out these expenses minutely and mathematically. It is an approximate estimate; and the estimate was \$250,000, including about \$90,000 for Members of Congress.

Mr. FALL. But there must be some basis even for an approximate estimate.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It was estimated by the Secretary of War that it would take \$160,000, excluding this large delegation from Congress.

Mr. FALL. And that is in addition to the amounts which are already appropriated and being used for keeping up the ships which will be used. I can understand why, if the shipping bill had passed, we will say, and \$40,000,000 had been put into vessels, and it had been the intention to take the merchant-marine fleet which we were to acquire around to San Francisco, quite an amount of money would be necessary to pay the expenses; but the vessels which are now in the service of the United States are being appropriated for and being paid for. It is proposed now to use those vessels, as I understand, and that in addition to their use and the expenses which are being paid by the Government there shall be a further amount of \$160,000. Upon what basis is that \$160,000 arrived at? As I say, all that I have before me now is the basis of the mileage, for instance, of Senators.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, surely the Senator can not mean to compare this to mileage—to take the representatives of the South American Republics, the diplomats and others—

Mr. FALL. There is nothing said about them.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia (continuing). And extend to them hospitality, and nobody knows how much hospitality. Nobody can foresee what ought to be done. The purpose was simply to put the Chief Magistrate of the country in a position to do those things that hospitality requires, and extend those courtesies which should be extended to our South American neighbors, and to the engineers and scientific men who have been connected with this great work, on the occasion of the formal opening of the Panama Canal. The nearest estimate we could get from the War Department was that it would take \$160,000, leaving out of consideration a large congressional delegation.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, we are now arriving at something which we can discuss. For the first time we understand now that the purpose of this appropriation is partly to pay the expenses of diplomats of other countries. Nothing whatsoever is said about that in the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is entirely up to the President to do all the things he thinks necessary and proper to be done on this great occasion to commemorate the opening of the greatest engineering work that ever has been completed in the history of the world.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to make a brief statement.

Mr. FALL. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. The President is not limited to diplomats. As I myself heard him say, he is likely to have in the party those persons who have been most directly interested in building the canal. It has been suggested that probably ex-President Taft and ex-President Roosevelt will be invited, and everybody who was connected with the building of this great canal ought to go.

Mr. REED. On the same boat, Mr. President?

Mr. OVERMAN. No; on separate boats. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is for the President of the United States to say whether he will invite either Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Taft.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There is no limitation on his authority, and there are no instructions to him. It is simply a question of whether or not Congress is willing to put at his disposal this amount of money for the commemoration of this great event.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have learned in the last few days of my legislative experience, and I am having it impressed on me now, that the ideas of some Members of the Senate are not in accord with those of others, and certainly those of one, that there shall be no question whatsoever as to any act of the Chief Executive of this Government; that he shall not be held responsible for the expenditure of the people's money. Forty million dollars may be placed in his hands absolutely without any restriction for building a railroad in Alaska. Forty million dollars more may be placed in his hands for the purchase of vessels without restrictions.

Mr. OVERMAN. What kind of restrictions would the Senator put on him?

Mr. FALL. I would not vote the money unless I knew what was going to be done with it, and I will not vote it unless I have some better evidence as to what is to be done with it.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator were going to draw the amendment, I should like to know what kind of an amendment he would draw and what kind of restrictions he would impose.

Mr. FALL. If I had intended to appropriate \$160,000 or \$160, I should have specified what the purpose of it was.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator would put everything in it in detail, and state how much was to be expended for each item?

Mr. FALL. I would undoubtedly say that it was for the purpose of enabling the President of the United States to invite to accompany him upon this ship foreign diplomats, for instance.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to know how the Senator is going to specify how much of this \$160,000 shall be spent for that purpose, and in what way it shall be spent.

Mr. FALL. Before I voted \$160,000 or \$1,000 or \$250,000 I should want to know something about the plan, so as to base the estimate upon it intelligently.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator would like to provide a certain amount for mileage, I suppose, and a certain per diem, and so much for subsistence, and so on, and say how much each foreigner should be allowed, and what it would cost each foreigner to go, and all those things, and how much grape juice should be supplied. [Laughter.]

Mr. FALL. I think it would be very easy, Mr. President, to say that the ships of war which are being furnished free, the naval vessels which are being furnished free, the services of the officers of the Army and Navy of the United States, which are being furnished free, are not included in this \$160,000. Then I should think it would have been easy enough—the committee have been in consultation with the President—to arrive at some general conclusion with him as to the total number who would accompany him, whether of his political or domestic family, or of foreign families, royal families, or merely commoners.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do not think he will draw any political line as to whether he will invite a Republican or a Democrat.

Mr. FALL. I have never yet heard a matter of this kind presented from a Republican source, and I am not here to draw any partisan or political lines; but I am asked here to vote away a sum of money that is being taken somewhere from the people of the United States. I think the President of the United States is still responsible to the people of the United States. I have just as much respect for his high position as is entertained by any Member upon that side of the Senate Chamber, or any member of the committee. I do not for one moment question the honesty of the President of the United States.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, does not the Senator recognize that whenever you attempt to specify exactly what shall be done a great many other things will arise that ought to be done, and they will be excluded by reason of the mention of the specific things?

Mr. FALL. The Senator understands well enough that I am not asking him nor the committee to specify the exact amount of money which shall be spent; but I am asking from the committee information to which, as a Member of the Senate, I am entitled as to what basis they used in arriving at the amount of \$160,000 as being necessary.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It was the opinion of those who were to have the matter in charge, taking into consideration the foreign diplomats who were to be brought there, and the other persons

who have some interest in the building of the canal, that this amount would be required.

Mr. FALL. I have understood that, but that answers nothing. How did you arrive at the conclusion that you should strike out \$90,000 from this item?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have told the Senator two or three times that that was arrived at by striking out all moneys appropriated to take Congressmen down there.

Mr. FALL. How many Members of Congress were you going to take with that \$90,000?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Two hundred and fifty or three hundred—three vessels loaded with them.

Mr. FALL. And you struck out \$90,000 for 250 or 300 Congressmen?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. We did.

Mr. FALL. And you have left in \$160,000 for how many?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do not know how many the President will take with him or how many diplomats he will invite from the South American Republics and from the world everywhere to be present on this occasion. I will say to the Senator, if he will excuse me for one moment, that this estimate was sent to us in a lump sum from the office of the Secretary of War. It was discussed in the committee; and, so far from there being any politics in it, there was not a single Republican or Democrat either in the Committee on Appropriations who said one word against the allowance of \$160,000 for the purpose specified in this amendment.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I repudiate the use of the word "politics" in this discussion. I have not used it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I did not say the Senator used it, but it has been used.

Mr. FALL. I have no earthly objection to the expenditure of any amount of money to enable the President of the United States to go to the San Francisco Exposition in the proper style befitting the President of the United States to carry out the purposes of this amendment, if I understand what they are, but I want some basis for my vote.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will read it to the Senator again.

Mr. FALL. I have read the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is all the basis I can possibly give the Senator.

Mr. FALL. Then, if that is all, I can certainly say that I have no more information than I had from reading it in the first place, and I do not propose to vote the money of the people, so far as I am concerned, without some better basis. I notice that there is another item here of \$25,000 for the contingent expenses of the President. Now, that is the usual amount.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, surely the Senator does not mean to say that he considers this a provision for the personal expenses of the President?

Mr. FALL. I do not know what it is for. That is what I am asking.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. This amendment makes clear what it is for.

Mr. FALL. I do not think it does. That is where we differ. I am asking some specific questions for information, and I can not get it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I hope the Senator will let me read it, so that it will go in the Record.

Mr. FALL. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia (reading):

For such expenses as, in the opinion of the President, are properly connected with the formal and official opening of the Panama Canal and each and every purpose connected therewith, \$160,000.

That is the purpose for which the \$160,000 is appropriated.

Mr. FALL. I am not willing to leave everything to the President of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is impossible to make a detailed statement of what these expenses are going to be.

Mr. FALL. It is entirely possible and perfectly feasible for the Senator, if he knows anything about the foundation of this item, to explain to the Senate of the United States upon what it is founded. Some basis must be had for it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have given the Senator all the information at my command.

Mr. FALL. Well, it is not satisfactory to me.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FALL. I will.

Mr. KENYON. It seems to me the Senator is getting some information.

Mr. FALL. I think so; yes.

Mr. KENYON. The \$90,000 was to cover the expenses of 250 Congressmen, as I understand the explanation.

Mr. FALL. I so understood from the explanation of the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. These Congressmen probably would be treated as well as diplomats or our brethren from South America.

Mr. FALL. They would have to receive different treatment from that accorded to them recently, then.

Mr. KENYON. Well, they probably would receive at least as good treatment. Therefore, the \$160,000, at that ratio, would carry about 450; so the Senator has secured the information that this appropriation will carry about 450 people.

Mr. FALL. I thank the Senator for the calculation he has made, which I have not had the time to make in the earnest effort in which I am now indulging to get information. How many diplomats, for instance, are included in this number of 450, approximately? The expenses of Army officers and Navy officers and officials of the Government, as I understand, are already being paid by the Government. Are there 450 diplomats, Members of Congress being excluded? I do not think we have 450 diplomats in the United States at the present time, including neutrals and belligerents.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FALL. For a question. I do not wish to yield the floor.

Mr. REED. It occurs to me that a much graver question than the one the Senator is discussing is involved in this matter, and has been brought out in the debate, and I want to get the Senator's opinion on it.

Mr. FALL. I am always ready, in my humble way, to give my opinion.

Mr. REED. It is stated that it is the purpose to take both ex-President Taft and ex-President Roosevelt on this trip.

Mr. FALL. Do I understand that that is the purpose?

Mr. REED. That has been stated. I wanted to ask the Senator what he thought would become of the doctrine of neutrality? [Laughter.]

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the other nations of the world have not joined with this Nation in declaring Panama a neutral zone. We have only done it ourselves, except by a treaty with England, some portions of which seem to have been repudiated. The other nations have not treated it as a neutral zone. I do not know whether I am correct in stating that possibly a part of this money is going to be expended for the protection of the diplomats or the members of the party who are to go through the Panama Canal to San Francisco, or whether it is simply for transportation. I want to get at something. Now, 450 people are to be carried along in addition to the President. The Senator says this is not for the payment of the expenses of the President, as I understand.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Of course everybody knows that. The Senator need not ask me that question. He knows that \$160,000 is not appropriated to pay the personal expenses of the President; and the amendment says it is for all expenses incident to the opening of the canal.

Mr. FALL. That means entertainment, music, and so forth?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It certainly must mean entertainment. That is certain. Not only South America, but the nations of the world, are interested in this great event.

Mr. FALL. Bands are furnished, I think, on all the naval vessels. Music is furnished free, I believe.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think it ought to be. I have nothing to do with the arrangements; but if they do not have music of the very highest order, they will be very remiss in the discharge of their duty, in my judgment.

Mr. FALL. I agree with the Senator. I think there is no doubt about that.

Mr. SHIVELY. In order to meet and obviate the objections made to this appropriation an amendment can be added that everybody on the voyage shall be required to live on mush and milk and shall eat it out of a jug with a pegging awl. [Laughter.]

Mr. FALL. If the Senator from Indiana, who is so familiar with mush and milk, desires to offer that amendment, I shall make no objection to it, because he knows more about it than I do. I am originally from Kentucky.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, something has been said here about inviting ex-President Taft and ex-President Roosevelt. I have had no conversation with the President except that I did communicate with him over the telephone and told him we proposed to leave out any provision of \$90,000 for Congress. That is the extent of my communication with him. I do not know whom he will invite or whom he will expect to come, but I shall be very much surprised if he fails to invite ex-President Taft and ex-President Roosevelt. There is no politics in this matter, and as they played a very conspicuous part in the construction of the canal it seems to me that the courtesy

of the occasion would require that they be invited and that they be provided for in a luxurious way in view of the distinguished part they took in the construction of this great work.

Mr. OVERMAN. Now, let us understand this matter, to see what is done. I want to state to the Senate the facts. I want to state whom the President took into his confidence. The Senator from New Mexico seems to be doubtful and suspicious. I am surprised that such a broad, patriotic Senator should be suspicious of the President and think he is going to spend some money that he ought not to spend. I will say to him that Mr. MANN, of the House, and Senator GALLINGER, of New Hampshire, and other Republicans were discussing this matter with the Democrats. Senators on both sides of the Chamber were discussing it, and this side of the Chamber agreed that this ought to be done. We laid the whole thing before them, and they agreed on the amount right through.

Mr. FALL. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars?

Mr. OVERMAN. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. FALL. Why did you strike out the \$90,000?

Mr. OVERMAN. Because of complaint on the part of some Congressmen, and some criticism, we struck out all about Congress. That was the amount we talked about; and the President called to his chamber the leaders on this side of the Chamber, so-called—and they are the leaders—and in the House of Representatives, and we all agreed on it. Now, the Senator is raising a row and having a suspicion go up that the Government will spend some few dollars it ought not to spend, and asking for every little detail, when all the President has done is to ask the Secretary of War how much money it will take, and the Secretary of War sends down to him and tells him what it will take. We got from the Secretary of War the amount it will take, and we propose to make the appropriation. What would the Senator have us do?

Mr. FALL. The Senator realizes that the names he mentions are those of the leaders of both Houses. It appears that after a consultation with the leaders of both Houses the House refused to put a dollar in this bill for any such purpose as is herein specified. There appears to be an understanding, however, the House of Representatives having failed to vote a cent, that we should place it in the bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let us get the facts straight again.

Mr. FALL. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. OVERMAN. The House of Representatives never had this matter before the committee.

Mr. FALL. This bill was before it.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all, in regard to this matter. This bill was pending in the House, and it was not intended to put it in the bill, but it was to be a separate measure.

Mr. FALL. Then this is new matter.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is no new matter. It is a matter put in so that we could pass it. The Senator knows that I introduced a joint resolution. I suppose it was introduced also in the House; but it is impossible to get it through at this session unless we put it on an appropriation bill.

Mr. FALL. What amount of money was appropriated in the joint resolution?

Mr. OVERMAN. In the original joint resolution \$250,000, just the amount agreed on.

Mr. FALL. Exactly. That has been, apparently, the amount agreed on all the way through.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the amount understood between us, and we afterwards concluded to put in \$160,000, the estimate that was understood in the President's executive chamber.

Mr. FALL. How was it understood? How did you arrive at the amount?

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator has been told a dozen times that the President asked the Secretary of War how much it would take, and he stated what it would take, and he recommended it, and the committee recommended it. What does the Senator want? Will he let us know?

Mr. FALL. What is your estimate?

Mr. OVERMAN. We made no estimate. The Secretary of War made an estimate of \$250,000, and we have taken the word of the Secretary of War that that is the amount required.

I want the Senator to suggest an amendment and say how he would make it. I would just like to know what sort of an amendment he would propose.

Mr. FALL. The Senator is very welcome to the responsibility which he so gracefully assumes of spending the people's money without any estimate of any kind, not even providing that so much of the amount as may be necessary shall be expended, but providing an outright appropriation of \$160,000 for certain purposes not shown in the bill at all.

Mr. President, I was just seeking to go back to some basis of legitimate estimates in expending the people's money. One

of the Senators seemed to think \$12,700 was enough mileage for Senators. I am willing to agree that the President of the United States is greater than the majority of this body. He has shown that, and they have shown it. I am willing to agree to that, and I would say—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him long enough to express the hope that he will continue to show it?

Mr. FALL. I know you will continue to show it, judging by your actions.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly I will follow the lead of the President of the United States as long as he is doing as well as he has done heretofore.

Mr. FALL. Following the Senator's own words, as well as the lead of the President of the United States, assuming that the President is greater than the majority of the Congress, he, in his judgment, thinking that \$12,700 is sufficient for all the Senators of the United States, he should at least agree with me that \$12,700 should be enough for the President of the United States. But admitting that he is greater than the entire Congress or the Senate, then double the amount, and with what is already provided for, as he has \$25,000 already provided for in the bill, we would have some basis.

Mr. WARREN. It is not provided for in this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to correct the Senator's continued and repeated statement that \$12,750 is appropriated for mileage. The bill appropriates \$51,000 for the mileage of Senators and \$175,000 for the mileage of Members of the House.

Mr. FALL. I agree with the Senator that the \$51,000 ought to continue to Senators.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator still continues to speak of \$12,750.

Mr. THOMAS. I am sorry to say that the Senator is as accurate in that statement as he has been in his criticism of the manner in which the President is expected to spend this money.

Mr. FALL. I notice that the tolls are omitted. I am glad the President has concluded with the foreign diplomats, at least that he does not find it necessary to the carrying out of his foreign policy that the ships carrying them should pay tolls. In fact, I have found some little sentiment of gratification in this discussion if not in the amendment as offered by the committee itself.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia and others. Question!

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to the committee amendment. I wish to say that I shall vote against the whole appropriation, but I think this amendment would make it better.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the amendment the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any expenses of Members of Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move to lay the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the amendment on the table.

Mr. KENYON. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I am paired for the afternoon with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], and I therefore ask to be excused from voting.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I do not see him in the Chamber and withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I transfer the pair I have with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and vote "yea."

Mr. SMOOT. My colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is absent from the Chamber on account of illness. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. If my colleague were here, he would vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. In his absence I will withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Ashurst	Hughes	Perkins	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Johnson	Pittman	Stone
Bryan	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Swanson
Burleigh	Martin, Va.	Robinson	Thompson
Camden	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth	Tillman
Chamberlain	Myers	Shively	Walsh
Chilton	Oliver	Simmons	Warren
Dillingham	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Fletcher	Owen	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—30.

Borah	Fall	Lodge	Smoot
Brady	Gore	McCumber	Sterling
Brandeggee	Gronna	Norris	Thomas
Bristow	Hollis	Page	Townsend
Burton	Kenyon	Polindexter	Vardaman
Cañon	La Follette	Pomerene	White
Clapp	Lane	Rood	
Crawford	Lippitt	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—31.

Clark, Wyo.	Hardwick	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Clarke, Ark.	Hitchcock	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Colt	James	O'Gorman	Stephenson
Culberson	Jones	Penrose	Sutherland
Cummins	Kern	Reed	Thornton
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Weeks
Gallinger	Lewis	Sherman	Works
Goff	McLean	Shields	

So Mr. KENYON's amendment to the amendment was laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Virginia to the appropriation of \$104,000 in the last naval appropriation bill for this purpose. The language of that appropriation is as follows:

Provided further, That the sum of \$104,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be expended, on the approval and authority of the Secretary of the Navy, for entertaining the officers and crews of foreign fleets which may be sent to attend and participate in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in consequence of the invitation of the President of the United States, extended in pursuance of the authority contained in the joint resolution of Congress approved February 15, 1911, and of the authority contained in the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1911.

This law as it now stands provides:

For defraying such other expenses incident to the visit of the said foreign fleets as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper, and the said sum shall be available until November 15, 1915.

It also provides for a rebate in tolls. I should like to ask the Senator whether the amount sought to be appropriated in the present bill is in addition to this sum, which has already been appropriated?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The appropriation to which the Senator from Michigan now refers has no relation whatever to this matter.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It has no relation to this matter?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. None whatever. It has nothing to do with the ceremonies of opening the Panama Canal. It is simply for the entertainment of the officers of foreign navies who may attend the Navy rendezvous at the Panama Exposition.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understand that even now this appropriation is being used for the purpose of entertaining naval visitors from abroad. I make no point against it. It is a very appropriate thing to do.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It will have to pass the auditing department of the Government and be shown by proper vouchers to have been expended in accordance with the provisions of that law, which has no relation whatever to the purpose of the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then, if I understand the Senator from Virginia correctly, the \$160,000 contained in the present bill is not for the purpose of being expended by the Navy Department?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is not, but by the President of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The appropriation heretofore made stands, and is to be expended as the Secretary of the Navy may think proper?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. For entertaining officers of foreign fleets at San Francisco.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations which had been passed over was, on page 124, to strike out lines 1 and 2, as follows:

That section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909, is hereby repealed.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Census of agriculture: For taking, compiling, and completing the census of agriculture required by section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909, providing for the Thirteenth and subsequent censuses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$2,286,100.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I want to submit a few observations with reference to this item, provided anybody will listen to them.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as this item amounts to over two and a quarter million dollars, and as the Senator from Iowa is going to speak to it, before he does so I think we had better have a quorum, as we are going to be asked to vote upon it. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fall	Nelson	Simmons
Bankhead	Gallinger	Norris	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Gore	Oliver	Smith, Ga.
Brady	Gronna	Overman	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Hollis	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Hughes	Page	Smoot
Burton	James	Perkins	Sterling
Camden	Johnson	Pittman	Stone
Cañon	Jones	Polindexter	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thomas
Chilton	Lane	Ransdell	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Tillman
Crawford	Lodge	Robinson	Townsend
Dillingham	McCumber	Rood	Vardaman
	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Warren
	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	White
	Myers	Shively	Williams

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. KENYON. I yield for a question.

Mr. PITTMAN. No; I do not care to ask a question. I had another matter in view.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like briefly and in as logical a manner as I can to explain this provision, which seeks to add \$2,286,100 to this bill. I think in a time of prosperity this would be an absolutely indefensible proposition, but it is even more so now, at a time when the Nation's revenues are not in the best condition. This item is entitled "Census of agriculture," which possibly may make it alluring at first glance to those who represent agricultural constituencies. I represent an agricultural constituency, and, as I believe, the best agricultural State in the Union; but there are no farmers, so far as I have been able to discover, who are asking for this appropriation.

The proposed census of agriculture will give no information that is not now possessed. It will be a duplication of work, because the same facts can be found by anyone who desires them in the census which has heretofore been taken or in the agricultural publications which are issued year by year. It does seem to me that when additional taxes are being levied upon the people under the guise of war taxes this Congress ought not to appropriate, except where it is essential, or reasonably essential, for the public interest and welfare to do so. The report of the House committee says as to this item:

Under section 31 of the act of July 2, 1909, providing for the thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, it is required that in the year 1915, and once every 10 years thereafter, a census of agriculture and live stock shall be taken; accordingly, based on estimates regularly submitted by the Department of Commerce, there is recommended in the accompanying bill the sum of \$2,286,100, including provision for the payment specifically of 1,000 temporary employments. As this expenditure is not an annual one, and will occur only once every 10 years, it constitutes no element for intelligent comparison of appropriations of one year with another, therefore the following comparison of the bill with the estimates submitted for 1916 and the appropriations for 1915 is made without reference to the estimates for this special service or the amount recommended therefor by the committee.

The House had this matter under consideration, and in the House bill as reported to that body it was provided as follows:

Census of agriculture: For taking, compiling, and completing the census of agriculture required by section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909, providing for the thirteenth and subsequent censuses, including the employment, in addition to the regular force of the permanent Census Office, of not to exceed 1,000 temporary clerks at a salary of not to exceed \$1,000 per annum for a period not to exceed two years, the Director of the Census—

And so forth.

The item also provided for "the employment of special agents at a salary not to exceed \$6 a day, with actual and necessary

traveling expenses and an allowance of not to exceed \$4 a day in lieu of subsistence," and so forth.

So that here is the carrying out of a provision of law, and that provision of law is taken from the act providing for the thirteenth decennial census. Section 31 of that act provides:

That there shall be in the year 1915, and once every 10 years thereafter, a census of agriculture and live stock, which shall show the acreage of farm land, the acreage of the principal crops, and the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country. The schedule employed in this census shall be prepared by the Director of the Census. Such census shall be taken as of October 1, and shall relate to the current year. The Director of the Census may appoint enumerators or special agents for the purpose of this census, in accordance with the provisions of the permanent census act.

Now, it is true, Mr. President, that this appropriation was made to carry out, I assume, the terms of that act. Upon discussion in the House of Representatives an amendment was offered to repeal section 31 of the act of 1909, and that amendment was carried, and is in this bill as it came from the House. The committee of the Senate, however, struck that out and substituted practically the old House proposition for this census of agriculture.

I contend, Mr. President, that there is no necessity for this census; that there is no demand for this census in the agricultural communities; that it will do one any good except those who are to obtain the great number of jobs that are proposed to be created by this provision.

Further than that, it is practically a duplication of work, for the Committee on Agriculture, in a bill which will be before the Senate in a short time, has provided an appropriation for a Bureau of Crop Estimates covering it, as will be found on page 58 of the Agricultural appropriation bill:

All necessary expenses for collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, and interpreting data relating to agriculture; for making and publishing periodically crop and live-stock estimates, including acreage, yield, and value of farm products.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRYAN. What is the amount of the appropriation in the Agricultural bill?

Mr. KENYON. The amount appropriated is \$283,480, to cover the entire expenses of the Bureau of Crop Estimates.

Mr. BRYAN. But for the crop estimates, what is the amount?

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator that I do not think that is differentiated from the general sum. Yes; \$142,000, as I read the bill. It is a little difficult to get at its real meaning.

Mr. President, there are three things to be covered by this enumeration of the census. One is the acreage of farm lands; another is the number of acres devoted to the cultivation of the principal crops; another is the number of domestic animals. I may say, in passing, that the print of this census would not be along for a year or two, the way things are ordinarily done, and would be of no value to the farmer. The farmer does not need this. He gets every year from the Agricultural Department a yearbook, and I hold in my hand the Yearbook for 1913. That yearbook, as I view it, with 145 pages, is devoted to the very things that would be covered by this agricultural census, and the farmer does not even read that yearbook in full.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. KENYON. I do, for a question.

Mr. BORAH. Was there any showing before the committee as to who desired to have this item put in the bill and what it was for?

Mr. KENYON. I will answer the Senator's question by turning to the hearings before the House committee. The Postmaster General appeared before the House committee and urged this appropriation, and I think I will place in the Record some of his language. These are the hearings for the year 1916, as I understand:

Mr. BURLISON. I think the inquiry should be directed to ascertain the number of acres in the farm in cultivation, the number of acres planted to the principal crops, and I think the principal crops are corn, wheat, oats, cotton, tobacco, and potatoes. I do not think it was intended to cover anything else.

Further down:

Mr. BURLISON. Then the bill was reintroduced, and I went before the Committee on the Census and made an argument—

In that I think he refers to the bill of 1909, providing for taking a census, to which there was added this provision for an agricultural census—

I went before the Committee on the Census and made an argument, and Secretary Wilson appeared and made an argument, and we hoped to put it through at that time. Later on, when Mr. Crumpacker brought

forward his bill, I took advantage of that opportunity and said: "Now, Brother Crumpacker, this goes in or there will be trouble," and he put it in.

That is the way this provision was engrafted on the original bill of 1909. The yearbook that is issued every year by the Department of Agriculture contains all of these things and all of these data.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. Is the information which is contained in the yearbook such accurate information as would be gathered from a census properly taken?

Mr. KENYON. I think the claim is now made that that is the reason for taking the census. I did not know of that until to-day; but I understand that the hearings before the Senate committee tended to show that the estimates here were not exact, and that is undoubtedly true.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator let me put in one paragraph here from a letter of the Secretary of Agriculture in reference to that matter?

Mr. KENYON. Yes. I will ask the Senator when that letter was written?

Mr. OVERMAN. It is dated December 15, 1914. I quote this in response to the question asked by the Senator from Idaho.

Accurate and timely estimates of crop and live-stock production are of vital interest to farmers, transportation companies, dealers, merchants, manufacturers, distributors, and consumers. Such estimates enable farmers to market their crops intelligently, transportation companies to estimate the number of cars required to move the crops, and other business men to avoid economic waste and loss in the conduct of their enterprises. Both producers and consumers are benefited by the economic and commercial adjustments which are based on estimates of agricultural production.

Then he goes on and shows by percentages that the statements that he is now circulating are false.

Mr. BORAH. From whom is the Senator reading?

Mr. OVERMAN. This is a letter from Secretary David F. Houston. He goes on to show that he can not make accurate estimates now on anything at all because of the errors he has found.

Mr. KENYON. That was before the year 1910, was it not?

Mr. OVERMAN. No; this is 1915.

Mr. KENYON. But he is referring to estimates before the year 1910. I do not think that discrepancy has existed since that time.

Mr. OVERMAN. But it is since the census reports are so incorrect. He is basing the estimate for this year on the census that has been taken, and he finds that in every State there is a difference, sometimes as high as 120 per cent. I presume that if we should look at Idaho, if I could find it, we would find a similar error. Let me see if I can find Idaho.

Mr. KENYON. Why would not those same discrepancies occur in the proposed census?

Mr. OVERMAN. The law itself requires that this census shall be taken every five years, and we think it is important that it should be done, in order that we may have correct estimates. It is impossible to get a correct estimate unless we have a census more frequently than once every 10 years.

Mr. KENYON. It is impossible to get correct estimates of crops, anyhow.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is another question.

Mr. KENYON. Take corn or oats. Some of it is put into silos; at times hogs are turned into cornfields. It is just a question of estimating, exactly the same as these reports are founded on estimates. You can not get anything more accurate.

Mr. OVERMAN. The estimate of the number of acres in the Senator's State is incorrect, I suppose. I will not say the Senator's State, but in many of the States the census reports are not correct, as shown.

Mr. KENYON. Oh, not exactly correct; no; but they come as near as human probability could expect them to be.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KENYON. I yield for a question. I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. SHIVELY. The Senator says that recently the estimates have been more nearly correct.

Mr. KENYON. Since the census of 1910.

Mr. SHIVELY. Yes. If that be true, if the service has been improved in such a way that the estimates are reliable, then, of course, these figures no longer have much significance. Just as an instance, however, the estimate for 1909 for South Carolina on the acreage of wheat was 381,000, and the census disclosed 43,000.

Mr. KENYON. There are a great many erroneous figures or estimates in 1909, but I ask the Senator if he will produce any for 1913 or 1914?

Mr. SHIVELY. No; I will not.

Mr. KENYON. I think the Senator can not.

Mr. SHIVELY. I do not say that the 1913 or 1914 estimates are correct or not correct. I am merely calling attention to those which have come under my observation and which are five or six hundred per cent in excess of the real fact.

Mr. KENYON. The census that was taken in 1910 was not published until 1913, as I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the practice of publishing the estimates each year necessarily brings the ninth year, just before the general census is taken, off as far as possible from the facts. Each year there is an estimate made, and then the next year an estimate is based upon that year and the next one upon that year, and at the end of the ninth year all of the mistakes that have been made during all of the 9 years show as soon as the general estimate of the 10 years is made. That is why the estimates of 1909 are so far from the facts—because they have been based upon the 9 preceding years, and all of the mistakes that were made during the 9 years show as soon as the census is taken for 1910. The present mode of estimating crops is no better than it was in 1908 or 1909, and the estimates are made exactly the same now as they were made then, but when the year 1919 comes all the mistakes of all the estimates of all the years will show as soon as the census is taken for 1920.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I have before me corroborative evidence, I think, of the statement of the Senator from Utah. In the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate there seem to be some discrepancies in 1909 and in 1899, every 10 years running on the "9" figure; but from 1909 on there are none shown at all.

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, can not the Senator see that it is not possible to show that a mistake has been made in the estimate unless we provide for enumerations, so that we can find out what the fact is?

Mr. KENYON. We have had every year the figures in the agricultural yearbook, which I understand the Senator says are incorrect.

Mr. BRYAN. But the reason the chief of the bureau does not show that there is a mistake since 1910 is because he does not know. It is simply an estimate, and the very purpose of this provision is to stop the estimate and attempt to get at the fact in 5 years, instead of waiting for 10 years.

Mr. KENYON. If nobody knows that there have been any mistakes in the estimates, who has been hurt by them?

Mr. BRYAN. Does not the Senator see—I think the Senator must see—that the only way to find out whether you have made mistakes or not is to go and get the facts? The Senator says that nobody has contended that the estimates since 1910 are not correct. The department does not believe they are correct, because, acting upon past experience, it knows that they have not been correct; and the very purpose of this provision is so that instead of allowing the estimates to accumulate from year to year for 10 years, within half that period we will take another census, so as to let the estimates begin from the census and from the facts ascertained. If you make an estimate based upon an error of the crop for one year, and base your next year's estimate upon that error, you very soon pile up errors until we had better stop issuing the estimates at all.

Mr. KENYON. Why, of course there will be errors, and when you multiply the errors for 9 or 10 years it will amount to some considerable amount; but does the Senator from Florida believe that the mistakes that have been made in estimates are sufficient to warrant this Congress, in the present condition of the finances of this Nation, in voting two and a quarter million dollars for this kind of a proposition?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, if I did not think so I would not be supporting the proposition. When the Senator gets through I will state why I think it is proper to support it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand this bill to be one making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government. This amendment provides for taking an agricultural census. I hope before the Senator takes his seat he will endeavor to explain if he can, what connection there is between an agricultural census and the expenses of the national legislative, executive, and judicial departments.

Mr. KENYON. Of course the theory is that it is one of the expenses attached to the executive branch of the Government acting through the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. THOMAS. But that is only a theory.

Mr. KENYON. It is only a theory; and of course the condition of affairs in the country now as to our finances is a condition, not a theory.

Mr. THOMAS. I quite agree with that. A few moments ago the Senator read from the testimony of Mr. Burleson explaining the manner in which the statute was enacted.

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. My only reason for taking up the time of the Senator is to emphasize the vicious practice by means of which so-called riders are attached to all sorts of bills entirely foreign, generally speaking, to the subject matter of those bills.

This is a provision which, if it is a good one, ought to stand or fall upon its own merits. It is placed in here as a part of this bill doubtless because it is the only way in which its passage can be secured, and it can be secured here by forcing it through upon the alternative either of making it a part of the bill or having the bill itself fail of passage. It is not right.

Mr. KENYON. It gets back to the old proposition, upon which I think the Senator and I agree, that the President ought to have the power to veto any item in an appropriation bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Why, there is no question but that if the President had the power to veto specific items in appropriation bills, he could and would save the people of this country millions of dollars every year.

Mr. KENYON. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. THOMAS. And if in our Constitution there were the same provision that appears in the constitutions of nearly all of the States of the Union, providing that no bill shall refer to more than one subject, which shall be expressed in its title, it would be impossible to effectuate legislation such as this.

Mr. KENYON. Of course I absolutely agree with the Senator, and I think the Senator will agree with another proposition—that if appropriations are to go on as they have been going on, and such matters as this are put into appropriation bills, and no system is established of correlation between the different committees or between the executive departments and Congress, this Government is going on the rocks financially.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that prophecy may be verified, Mr. President. The difficulty lies in our system. Both parties are to blame for it.

Mr. KENYON. That is true.

Mr. THOMAS. Neither party seems to be able to correct it. Until some satisfactory system of estimating our receipts and expenditures can be made the basis of financial legislation the expenditures of the Government are going to increase, and increase constantly; and there is no question but that it will lead to bankruptcy unless some such method can be devised and put into effect in the course of a few years.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether he does not think this item is quite as germane to the title of the bill as many other items named in the bill. I turn to page 123, just at random, and for an example; and under the heading "Census Office" I find this:

For securing information for census reports, provided for by law, semi-monthly reports of cotton production, periodical report of stocks of baled cotton in the United States and of domestic and foreign consumption of cotton—

And so forth.

That is quite as germane, is it not, as the item now under consideration?

Mr. KENYON. Oh, unquestionably.

Mr. STERLING. Is not this an item for the payment of the expenses of one of the departments of the Government, an appropriation for the executive department, and therefore is it not proper so far as that is concerned?

Mr. KENYON. Oh, I am not raising the point that it is not proper, possibly, in this bill. I am raising the objection that it is a perfectly useless thing, in the first place, and, secondly, that if there is any necessity for it this is not the time to appropriate this two and a quarter million dollars.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. STERLING. Just a word further, if the Senator will permit me, not exactly in the nature of a question.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, under the rules of the Senate I can not yield for anything but a question.

Mr. JONES. There is no filibuster on now.

Mr. KENYON. Is that applicable only during a filibuster?

Mr. JONES. Yes; that is all.

Mr. STERLING. I will waive the matter until later, then.

Mr. JONES. Referring to the proposition of the President having the power to veto a proposition in an appropriation bill, I will say to the Senator I think it might be well if the President had that power, and I would vote to give it to him; but I do not think that it would result very much in the curtailment of appropriations. I wish to suggest to the Senator that in the sundry civil bill alone Congress is appropriating \$12,000,000 less than the estimates from the department, and the President would not very likely veto any proposition in a bill that was urged pretty strongly by one of his executive officers. So we are not going to get economy by vesting the President with the power to veto an item in an appropriation bill. The only way is to make the appropriations and cut them down ourselves.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio for a question.

Mr. POMERENE. The question I desire to ask is this: It was stated by the Senator that there were certain estimates of acreage, and so forth, given in the Agricultural Yearbook, and it was stated that those estimates were not reliable.

Mr. KENYON. I have not said that.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, no; I say it was stated that those estimates were not reliable. Is the Senator able to give us any information which would indicate the difference between the actual acreage and the estimates which are given?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, if the estimates of the crops and statistics that are sent out in the Agricultural Yearbook every year are not reliable, we had better stop publishing it, because it is a matter of great expense. This is sent all through the country, and I have never before heard it claimed that they were not reliable and up to date.

Mr. POMERENE. In reading some of the testimony, I notice that there seemed to be certain discrepancies in certain States, but whether that was shown I have not been able to advise myself. I was wondering whether the Senator had any specific information on that subject.

Mr. KENYON. I have some here, and if I can find it I will refer to it later.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator please, I will read just a few lines from the statement given before the subcommittee by Secretary Redfield as to one State:

Senator SMOOT. For what period of time, Mr. Secretary?
Secretary REDFIELD. From 1899 to 1913. If I may take your own State, Mr. Chairman—

I happened to be chairman of the subcommittee—

as an example, I find that the acreage of corn in North Carolina in the year 1899 was found to be in error by a shortage of 262,000 acres, and in 1909 it was found to be in error by an excess of 438,000 acres.

Then in Utah there was about the same percentage, and so with a great many of the States.

Mr. KENYON. I will answer that. We appropriate every year about \$150,000 in the Agriculture appropriation bill for the Secretary of Agriculture to get these estimates. If they are wrong every year why do we keep on doing this?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion there to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I will yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I was on the committee that reported this bill, and I took leave to differ from the committee on this particular item. I did not believe that it ought to be passed. But I want to say that it is almost impossible, even if you have an accurate census taken one year, to estimate what will be the acreage the next year. Whenever the price of products in one line goes up a great acreage follows, and whenever a product declines, as the price of wheat or something like that, gets low, then, as a matter of fact, the production falls. But accuracy of estimate is almost impossible. I have found that whenever you make an accurate statement in regard to the census on a matter, the people are very much disappointed in it. It is true in population; it is true in everything. Every State is trying to boom its products, saying it produces so much, and certain statements are made in relation to it, and whenever you take an accurate statement it is disappointing to the people, and they want to have another one taken right over again.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, here are three finely bound books, "Thirteenth Census of the United States," volumes 5, 6, and 7. They are all devoted to agriculture and were published in 1913, and every conceivable question extant, of crop, stock, land irrigation, everything that could be thought of with relation to the farming interests of this country, is covered in that census which we have had only for use now for a couple of years.

I wonder how many farmers have ever read it or paid any attention to it, or very few other people, for that matter? If this is being done in the name of the farmer he has not asked

for it and he does not want it. There are too many statistics now that are compiled by theorists as to the farmer. We simply stuff him with statistics. He knows a good deal more about it than the young fellow with rolled-up trousers at the bottom, who goes to him with a cigarette and instructs him how to farm and asks questions of him, such as: "How many children have you, and why," and "Are you married, and why," and "Have you no children, and why," and a lot of infernal nonsense that is ground up for the farmers every year. They do not want it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the statistics or estimates are very valuable to the man who wants to buy or sell on the market, so as to ascertain whether he can make a bigger profit out of the farm than he could otherwise?

Mr. KENYON. Exactly. It might do the Chicago Board of Trade a lot of good to have these expenditures made. Here is a census that has cost this country \$15,000,000, and \$4,000,000 of that was devoted to this agricultural census.

Now, over on the House side, I want to read what some of the Democratic House leaders said about this matter. Mr. PAGE of North Carolina said, in the debate—

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BRYAN. For the sake of economy of time more than anything else I object to the Senator from Iowa reading from the debates in the House of Representatives and from speeches made there.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Chair hold that this is correct?

Mr. BRYAN. Jefferson's Manual, on page 96, says that it is improper to refer in the Senate to what is said in the House, and vice versa. The rule is not based on whether it is adverse criticism. I think the Senator from Iowa is familiar with that. If the Senator, for example, will read from a Member of the House, and desires to commend him for what he said and to agree with him, some other Senator in answer to that might be led into an adverse criticism of what was said. The correct way is not to refer to debate in the House at all.

Mr. KENYON. Without conceding the point, I believe there is a good deal of force in it and I do not want to make a precedent of it. Of course, I am perfectly willing not to read the debate, but I will merely refer to matters that took place.

Mr. SHAFROTH. As the question is one of time, I should think we could agree that within half an hour from this time we shall take a vote on this amendment. Would that be satisfactory?

Mr. KENYON. I will not take more than 10 minutes, and that would require a roll call.

Mr. SHAFROTH. We want to get this bill out of the way.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we spent a great deal of time this morning over an item of \$280. We are now considering one of two and a half million dollars, and yet there are not half as many Senators upon the floor as were in attendance then. I wonder if \$280 for an employee is more important to the senatorial mind than two and a half million dollars to be expended upon a measure of this sort. It seems to me that we ought to debate it. If we are going to have a cloture rule, that is all right; but we have spent weeks here in idle debate upon many subjects, the purpose of which was of course entirely obvious. Now the Senator is calling attention to a very large item in an important measure at a time when the revenues of the Government are not in a satisfactory condition, and it is something, it seems to me, to which we should give our most serious attention.

Mr. SHAFROTH. My object was simply to facilitate the passage of the bill. I do not believe that the amendment just offered would carry, and I wanted to dispose of it just as soon as we reasonably could. I recognize that it is a big item and that it ought to be carefully considered.

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator will give bond that it will not be carried, I will quit; but I have not taken very much time of the Senate in the last few weeks. I have not been in sympathy with the filibuster, although not at all opposed to filibustering.

I will not offend the legislative sensibility of my friend from Florida, and I will not read the RECORD, but I want to say that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the House made a speech against this provision of the House bill. He seemed to have some serious doubt about the financial condition of the Government. In that speech he showed what were the estimates for the fiscal year 1916 and how the expenditures would be a great deal more than the estimates. He pointed out that it was most unfortunate that the country was now subjected to this war tax, and that it was the duty of the Government to refrain from any unnecessary appropriations. He made

a very strong argument, which I hope those who are in doubt will read.

Now, Mr. President, in addition to all this information which the farmer has and which he knows vastly more about than those furnishing it, there is a bulletin issued every once in a while that goes out to the farmers of the country covering the matters in which they are peculiarly interested and setting forth some of the facts that would be covered by this census. The last one is January 1, 1915. It is so up to date that it deals with the question of the foot-and-mouth disease. I think it can not be questioned that it is accurate, because it places Iowa as the first State of the Union in the production of crops.

I would not vote against anything, Mr. President, that in my judgment was for the benefit of the farmers or the agricultural interests of the country, because agriculture is the basis of all our wealth and all our prosperity, but I believe that this is not for the benefit of the farmers of the country, but merely creates a vast number of jobs the salaries of which the farmers in additional taxes must help to pay for.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa is correct in his conclusion, that this amendment will serve no useful purpose and that its only effect will be to give employment to enumerators, of course it ought not to be agreed to. I am rather forced to the conclusion that the Senator from Iowa has not given the hearing that was had by the Senate committee that careful attention to which it is entitled before the statement was made that this item is indefensible. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator from Iowa raise any objection to the item immediately preceding this one, which completes the expenditure of \$1,000,000 for the taking of the census of manufactures.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, there was no roll call on that, but I voted against it. I am not any more in favor of that item than I am in favor of this one.

Mr. BRYAN. Very well. I have the purpose in rising to try to explain to the Senate briefly the reasons which led the committee to recommend the inclusion of this item in the bill. At first blush it appeared to us that we might save this expenditure, and that we might justly do so. I take leave to say just here that the members of the Committee on Appropriations are as anxious to save wherever it can legitimately be done as is the Senator from Iowa.

But, Mr. President, there came before the committee the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the Census, and we were furnished with a carefully prepared statement from the Director of the Census and from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Now, let us see what the Secretary of Agriculture says about this item. He says:

The necessity for taking an agricultural census in 1915 is especially urgent because of the fact that unprecedented changes in the acreages sown to different crops will probably take place during the coming season because of the abnormal marketing conditions resulting from the war in Europe. It is already apparent that the largest acreage of winter wheat in the history of this country has been sown. If the war continues, the acreage sown to spring wheat next season will probably be larger than for many years. The acreage already sown to winter oats and cover crops in the South is believed to be larger than ever before.

The Director of the Census pointed out that they have two ways of furnishing statistics on crops. One is by an estimate acquired as carefully as possible by communications with individual farmers and with organizations that the State has created. Another is by an examination, by an enumeration, by the taking of a census. A census is taken every 10 years. The last census deals with conditions existing in 1909. The last time the Government acquired the facts upon which the acreage and the condition of agriculture could be stated was for the year 1909. Therefore it is not surprising that the statistics with the tables furnished, and from which the Senator read, do not show any discrepancy between the estimate and the census or enumeration since 1909, because no census or enumeration has been taken or had.

That is the very purpose of this item. It was the very purpose Congress had in view when in 1909 it provided that midway between the taking of the census of population, of agriculture, of manufactures, and of live stock there should be taken an agricultural census. As I understand from the hearings and from the statements made before the committee, the Bureau of the Census takes the census of 1910 as the basis, and they add to or subtract from that basis in order to arrive at an estimate of acres planted to agricultural products. From year to year that is done. If an error is made, the error is repeated from year to year.

So, Mr. President, however valuable the census of 1910 may be, five years have gone by. Suppose it is inaccurate; that a mistake has been made and is continued; what would be the result if it is not corrected until 1920? Let us see what was

the result in the preceding 10 years. I will only call attention to mistakes of estimates, which amounted to more than 40 per cent.

In Alabama the wheat crop was underestimated 54.2 per cent in 1899; in 1909 it was overestimated 61.7 per cent. In Arkansas in 1899 the wheat crop was underestimated 40.1 per cent; in 1909 it was overestimated 149 per cent. In Colorado in 1909 the wheat crop was underestimated 58.7 per cent. In Connecticut in 1899 the estimate was higher than the enumeration, and there was a mistake of 89.7 per cent. In Delaware in 1899 there was an overestimate of 205 per cent on the oat crop. In Georgia in 1909 there was an overestimate of the wheat crop of 163.3 per cent, and in 1899 there was an overestimate of the oat crop of 49.8 per cent. In Idaho in 1899 there was an underestimate of the wheat crop of 46.6 per cent and of the oat crop of 50 per cent; in 1909 there was an underestimate of the oat crop of 42.2 per cent. In Kansas in 1899 there was an overestimate of the oat crop of 49.9 per cent. In Kentucky in 1899 there was an overestimate of the oat crop of 43.8 per cent. In Maine in 1899 there was an underestimate of the wheat crop of 70.7 per cent, and in 1909 there was an overestimate of 164 per cent. In Maryland in 1899 there was an overestimate of 63.3 per cent, and in 1909 of 43.1 per cent upon the oat crop.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida how it is known that a mistake was made in the first estimate when they did not have a census? Here it is stated a mistake was made. How do they know a mistake was made?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado, like the Senator from Iowa, has not yet grasped this question. The only time they can tell when a mistake is made in the estimate of a crop is when they have taken the census. In 1909 they made an estimate and also in 1909 they had made a count. They found that the estimate was wrong in some instances by 700 per cent.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; and in the other years I can readily see that where a census is taken the mistake can be corrected; but if you have a census only once in every 10 years, I should like to know how you can say that these estimates are wrong or not wrong?

Mr. BRYAN. You can only tell at the end of the period.

Mr. SHAFROTH. At the end of 10 years?

Mr. BRYAN. Of course. The very object of this item is that the period shall not be so long and that the mistakes shall not be so great.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If there has been a mistake in the estimates for the years following 1909 the mistake is estimated on the census of 1910, is that it?

Mr. BRYAN. There has been nothing but an estimate since 1909, and in the very nature of things there can not be.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not understand how you can say that an estimate was off 62 per cent or off 105 per cent when you have not a census by which to correct it.

Mr. BRYAN. But they had a census in 1909; and when they took the census they showed that the estimates were out of plumb.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But they were out of plumb for that one year.

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, yes; that is the only year they take the census—at the end of the 10-year period.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to get some information on this point. I notice the amendment reads:

For taking, compiling, and completing the census of agriculture required by section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909.

The House bill has a provision repealing that act. This is to complete the census. I infer from that that some work has been done along that line?

Mr. BRYAN. I beg to say that this amount of money will enable the Director of the Census to take, compile, and complete the agricultural census, and that he will have it available by July 1, 1916.

Mr. GALLINGER. When was the work done?

Mr. BRYAN. It has not been done.

Mr. GALLINGER. It needs completion. The language is "completing the census."

Mr. BRYAN. This is the idea: We are giving authority here to take, compile, and complete the whole work.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is it proposed to make an entirely new census of agriculture?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. To start de novo?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. And to complete it?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes. Now, take Massachusetts. In 1899 the estimate on the oat crop there was greater than the enumeration showed by 121 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. BRYAN. Just a moment. In Minnesota in 1909 they overestimated the wheat crop by 70.9 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator know how these mistakes can be corrected except by the taking of a census every year?

Mr. BRYAN. Why, Mr. President, of course there may be some mistakes, but the Senator ought to know that if you correct the basis upon which you are acting and do not repeat the mistakes each year it will not be as great in 5 years as it would be in 10.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is true, Mr. President, but I must confess I am more concerned about the estimates of the national revenues just at present, and it seems to me that they ought to be considered in this connection.

Mr. BRYAN. I did not yield to the Senator for a speech. I understand his position.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. BRYAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask whether these estimates are made on the quantity of such products as wheat?

Mr. BRYAN. They are made on the acreage.

Mr. SHAFROTH. On the acreage?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes. To resume where I was interrupted, I will state that in Mississippi the estimate of the oat crop in 1909 was 150,000 acres, while, as a matter of fact, there were only 97,000 acres, an overestimate of 54 per cent.

Mr. President, I will not take up each State, showing the mistakes which have been made, but they range from a very small amount to as much as 700 per cent.

Now, is it of any value to have these figures correct? Does it make any difference whether these estimates are right or wrong? We issue a Statistical Abstract, which is accepted as containing correct information. Ought it to be issued when in it, according to the admission of the very departments which compile the information, are errors ranging from a fraction of 1 per cent to 700 per cent? Is it of any value to the farmers, for whom my friend from Iowa speaks, to have some idea of the acreage sown to wheat? Is it of any interest to the cotton grower to know the number of acres planted in cotton? Why, Mr. President, do we undertake to have this Government, through some one or more of its departments, arrive at estimates of the crops of the country? There are corn exchanges in the big cities; there are cotton exchanges; they make their estimates every year of the acreage of wheat or of the bushels of wheat that will be produced and of the acreage of cotton or of the bales of cotton that will be produced. They are interested in showing that there will be a large supply, an oversupply, of these products of the farm, while the farmer is interested in having the impression prevail that there will be an undersupply so that the price will be higher. The exchanges that sell these great products upon the market issue their estimates. The farmers do not get out a bulletin showing the acreage or making their estimates. Who will do it for them? Are they to take the estimates of the cotton exchanges and of the corn exchanges and of the wheat exchanges? Are they to be satisfied with whatever estimate is arrived at by gentlemen interested in depressing the price of their products? Is it of no consequence to the producer to have some idea of whether there will be an oversupply of farm products or whether there will be an undersupply? If a man is trying to make up his mind what to plant this year, ought he not to have all the information possible as to the sort of crop he will plant? Are you willing to leave the department to go ahead and make guesses, in which, when once an error creeps in, it remains? Are you willing simply to let the producer depend upon the statements and estimates of interested parties as to their products? If not, who else is to make the estimates?

That has been assumed to be the duty of the Government. It has been doing it for many, many years; but it has been found out that if you only make the enumeration, as the census is taken, every 10 years, the statistics are mere guesswork, and it would be of great value to the people who produce these products and as a matter of public concern to have the real facts known.

The Senator from Iowa pointed to the three books containing the census of agriculture for 1909, and which he says are now useless because out of date. Perhaps they are not as valuable as they were when published, but they are valuable. However, Mr. President, it does seem to me that we ought to do one of two things. We ought to quit issuing the yearbooks which the

Senator says and the departments that issue them say are unreliable and misleading, or, if we intend to issue these reports, they ought to be issued in such form that everybody who reads them would have some reason to suppose that they are reliable.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator realize that the present agricultural appropriation bill contains an appropriation of quite a large sum of money "for making and publishing periodically crop and live stock estimates, including acreage, yield, and value of farm products"?

Mr. BRYAN. How many men are provided for that purpose, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. KENYON. I do not think that is stated.

Mr. BRYAN. The number is 79. Does the Senator think that they could take a census of the agricultural acreage of this country?

Mr. KENYON. Of course they will only get an estimate from the farmers. The census is more accurate, I grant; but, nevertheless, it is more or less an estimate, and it can not be anything else. Why not stop appropriating this other money if it does not result in obtaining accurate information?

Mr. BRYAN. No, Mr. President, I think not. I do not believe the Senator from Iowa has ever yet found out the reason for the insistence of the department for the inclusion of this item in this bill.

Mr. KENYON. Well, I have my idea about their insistence.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator asks why do they not contradict the estimates since 1910. Because they have not yet secured the facts by which they could show whether they were true or untrue. That is the complete answer. They can not show whether they are accurate or reliable until they get the facts again, and it is not compatible with the proper respect which should be entertained for the accuracy of Government publications to send them out year by year containing estimates that may be wrong, which have been wrong in the past, and which are calculated to mislead the public, when we can obtain the facts. I have no doubt the money proposed to be expended for getting the facts every five years will be well expended and will be in the interest of accuracy and of economy.

The Senator from Iowa says he stands for the farmer. Then the farmer ought to have an estimate made and a census taken by a disinterested party, and ought not to have to rely upon the estimates furnished by people who are buyers of the very articles the production of which they estimate. Every farmer will claim that there is a short crop and every buyer will claim that there is a large crop. It seems to me it is the duty of the Government, if it can do so, to arrive at the facts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LANE. It seems to me, from listening to the Senator from Florida, that this appropriation will be more valuable to the brokers, the men who sell the crops long or short, than it will to the farmer himself. I do not believe that as a rule the farmer reads these statistics.

Here is an appropriation asked for of about \$2,000,000 to take a census. It seems, under the present plan, that nine times out of ten the department guesses at it, and guesses wrong, to the tune of 700 per cent, say. It seems to me that it would be cheaper to strike a general average of the errors and base their estimates on conclusions deduced in that way, and thus they would arrive pretty nearly at the facts.

It reminds me somewhat of the old man whose boy came home from college, and the father was interested in knowing what information he had gathered there; and having been a graduate of the same school he put his son through an examination. The father was telling a neighbor about it the next day. The neighbor asked: "How did he come out?" The father replied: "He did finely. Nine problems out of ten I put to him he said he did not know, and his answer was right about every one. The tenth problem I placed before him he tried to solve, and made a fool of himself." [Laughter.]

It seems to me that here we have a case where nine times out of ten the guess is wrong, and the farmer has been fed on that sort of information for, lo, these many years. Unless this appropriation is a continuing one, the misinformation will begin to accumulate year by year in the same proportion that it has in the past.

It is my opinion that with the funds of the Government in the condition they are now, it is going to cost the farmer more than the information will be worth to him. I question the wisdom of it at this time. I think he will be able to get along better than he has in the past, and at less cost, if the department will furnish him a fair average of its errors based on

past experience, to be used by him for his guidance in the future.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to say only a word on this item.

I think it is a mistake to say that a careful enumeration of acreage and crops is of no value, but I believe it can be done more cheaply by the States than it can be done by the Government of the United States. In North Dakota we require the assessors to take an enumeration of the acreage every year, and a report is made to the commissioner of agriculture, so that from year to year we have the acreage. Of course, it is very easy to make a mistake in estimating a crop, even if you have the acreage. If you estimate a crop of 20 bushels to the acre early in the season, perhaps later on something will happen to the crop, and you will get only one-half or two-thirds of that, so that necessarily there is a mistake in the estimate. That will happen even if you appropriate this money and appoint census enumerators to take the census under the provisions of this amendment; but it is of value to the farmer and to the country.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BRYAN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield.

Mr. BRYAN. The enumeration is to be taken as of the month of October, which is supposed by the department to be the best month for getting an accurate return.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. Formerly it was taken, by the Thirteenth Census, in the spring. Of course floods and frosts might come along and destroy the crop, but it was thought that the month of October would give a pretty fair idea of that year's crop.

Mr. GRONNA. That is true, Mr. President, as the Senator from Florida has stated. If a census is taken after the crop has been harvested, of course you can get correct figures. It will not be an estimate; it will be actual results. But the question is whether or not we shall appropriate this great sum of money. Every year we are appropriating more and more money. I remember that when I was a boy I heard a Member of Congress say that the Congress had been extravagant; they had expended almost half a billion dollars. Now we expend more than \$1,000,000,000 every Congress.

I believe it is of great value, not only to the farmers but to the entire country, to have a census or an enumeration of agricultural products and of stock, but the question is whether we should pay this immense amount of money for it. So far as North Dakota is concerned, we take the census every year at the expense of the State. It is very little work for the assessor, when he makes his assessment—and that has to be made every year—to take an enumeration of the acreage. Of course we would not have the estimate of the crop, because that would have to be done in the fall of the year.

I think, however, I shall vote against the amendment, because we are appropriating more money than we ought to appropriate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. This item provides for the expenditure of \$2,286,100. That is added to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill by a rider placed upon it by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

It is difficult for me, sir, even to imagine any proper defense for the insertion of the provision calling for this expenditure at this time.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if he calls this a rider upon an appropriation bill?

Mr. THOMAS. Why, of course, it is a rider.

Mr. OVERMAN. Why, Mr. President, this item is estimated for by two departments of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not care if it is estimated for by all of the departments and by the British Parliament.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am talking about whether or not it is a rider.

Mr. THOMAS. My understanding of a rider is an amendment not germane to the bill, and the mere fact that there has been an estimate for this item does not make it germane.

Mr. OVERMAN. Did the Senator read the two lines that were stricken out?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I did. I am sorry to say that I read the two lines that were stricken out.

Mr. OVERMAN. Those two lines were stricken out by the committee, and this amendment was reported to the House as we have it.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand.

Mr. OVERMAN. On the floor they struck out the two lines and the effect of that was to repeal the law. Instead of repealing the law as it was passed by a former Congress, we have carried into effect the law that was passed.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, Mr. President; I am quite aware of the fact that in this bill the House repealed, or attempted to repeal, a section of another law. That was a rider, too. I understand what is meant by that expression. I do not think it had any place in this bill. Of course I do not mean that it was wrong, because I am well aware of the practice and of the fact that it is permissible under our system of proceeding; but the Senate committee, instead of standing by that provision, proposes to reinsert it and add to it an appropriation of \$2,286,100 in order that it may be carried into effect.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party has been criticized, and very justly, by Senators upon the other side for its disregard of its platform pledge as to economy. While I know that this criticism has come in most instances from Senators who have not themselves voted in accordance with their criticism; while I am quite aware of the fact that, except in a few individual cases, no effort has proceeded from that side to limit our expenditures; while I am quite aware of the fact that many of the so-called pork-barrel bills have been supported just as earnestly upon that side of the Chamber as upon this, I want to warn my Democratic brethren that we are going to be held responsible for our disregard of that duty and not the Republican Party. They can vote for these measures just as we do; and I understand that this amendment received practically unanimous support in the committee, there being but one dissenting voice in regard to it. Nevertheless, those upon the Republican side who vote with the supporters of this amendment will be quite as constant and quite as vociferous in their charges of violation of platform pledges here as though they had opposed it.

Mr. President, we know that we are approaching a deficiency. We are all painfully aware of the fact that the finances of the Government are not in good condition. I am not going to go into the causes of this condition. Men differ about it. A great deal of political capital has been sought to be made, and will be sought to be made, upon it. Democratic legislation will be charged with being responsible for it. It has been; but the fact remains, irrespective of causes, that there is a deficiency; and now the Democratic majority of the Senate of the United States proposes, in this good year, under those conditions, to spend over two and a quarter million dollars in order to take an agricultural census. Why, Mr. President, I do not care how important it may be; if it is not an emergency, if it is not one of those urgent conditions that we can not avoid, this appropriation ought not to be made at this time.

I do not profess to be the only Member of this body interested in a reduction of governmental expenditures. I am quite aware of the fact that we all entertain that view, but we always make an exception of those individual appropriations in which we are either directly concerned or indirectly concerned for some constituent; and of course the pressure of the people themselves upon the Congress of the United States for appropriations for all conceivable purposes has much to do with our extravagance. As I say, to the extent to which we yield to these importunate demands, no matter how great the pressure, we will be held responsible.

I am aware that I am talking to an impatient audience. I am not unmindful of the expressions around me that if we do not quit talking we will never pass the bill; but I record my protest, as one of the Members of this body, against the expenditure of this vast sum of money at this time for a purpose that is not absolutely necessary, and I shall vote against it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not there are some other matters in the bill that could be disposed of at this time. I think we should have a larger attendance before a vote is taken on this matter.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the idea is to dispose of this and be done with it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I would rather dispose of it tonight if it is possible to do so.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think we have a pretty large attendance.

Mr. KENYON. I do not want to delay the passage of the bill in any way, but I do feel that we should have a larger attendance on this important amendment. Will not the bill have to go over until to-morrow in any event?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I hope not. I do not know what discussion may be desired about the bill. I am very much disappointed that we can not pass it to-night.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have a motion to make.
Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am afraid, Mr. President, that the debate is just beginning.

Mr. KENYON. There are some amendments to be offered, I know; and if it is proposed to ask for a vote on this amendment to-night I shall be compelled to call for a quorum. It is about 6 o'clock, anyhow, and it seems to me we might as well take a recess now.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I had expected to finish this bill early to-day.

Mr. THOMAS. Why not hold a night session?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I would if I could get Senators to stay here, but it has been difficult to keep them here this long. They have been talking about leaving for an hour, and we can not get them to stay here. I should be very glad if we could get a vote on the bill. I do not think the discussion is going to change anybody's vote. Every Senator must know what he thinks about this amendment. I do not see what good talk does about it.

Mr. KENYON. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If we can get a vote that is all I want, and we could finish the bill to-night. The Senate has a right to do as it pleases about the matter. It is no disappointment to me. Whatever the Senate wants will suit me. The Members of the Senate can vote it in or vote it out, just as they see fit, but I should like to get a vote now.

Mr. KENYON. I think we have made tremendous progress on this bill to-day. I should be glad to see it passed.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There has been real progress, but there have been very few disputed items in it.

Mr. KENYON. As far as I am concerned, I do not want to be a party to delaying the bill to-night, but I shall ask for the yeas and nays on this proposition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the request seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I simply wish to inquire of the Senator from Virginia if it would not be possible to take a recess until 8 o'clock to-night? Then, by having a night session, we could surely dispose of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I should be glad to do that, but there are so many Senators protesting against it that I hardly feel justified in expecting them to attend a night session.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I had an understanding that at 6 o'clock the Senate would take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. I have told a number of Senators that that would be done, and they have gone. I really think, in justice to that statement made by me, that the Senate ought to take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

I will say to the Senator that I have not a word to say upon the question. I think we are ready to vote upon it, and if a recess is taken I do not think there will be any discussion upon it in the morning.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. All I am afraid of is that in the morning we will come back with a fresh start and we will have a dozen speeches and they will occupy the day.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I do not think so. I do not think there is any intention whatever of debating the matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Can we get unanimous consent to vote on the amendment at 11.30 to-morrow?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I suggest that the Senator try it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that we vote on this amendment not later than 11.30 to-morrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I will make no objection if the Senator will make it 12 o'clock.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator has just said he was through. Why does he want to carry it over for a longer time?

Mr. KENYON. No; I said to the Senator that I had an amendment to offer to the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But this is only on this amendment.

Mr. KENYON. Oh, on this amendment. Yes, indeed; that is all right. I thought the Senator meant on the bill itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia requests unanimous consent to vote on this amendment not later than 11.30 o'clock to-morrow. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and that agreement is entered into.

RECESS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 20, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 19, 1915.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, from whom are all things temporal and spiritual, increase our spiritual vision and our moral integrity, that we may meet all the duties and responsibilities of life with perfect faith and confidence in the overruling of Thy providence, assured that all things work together for good to them that love Thee and seek to do Thy will; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Journal states that the point of no quorum just before adjournment was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. The RECORD correctly shows that the point of order was made by Mr. MOORE. I ask to correct the Journal to conform to the fact.

The SPEAKER. The Journal will be corrected to conform to the fact.

The Journal as corrected was approved.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the pension appropriation bill which was passed yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the pension appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WORDS SPOKEN IN DEBATE.

The SPEAKER. When the House adjourned last night the pending question was the motion for the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] to strike from the RECORD certain words spoken in debate by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I withhold the demand for the previous question and yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, as I stated last night, I had no desire to reflect on the honor and integrity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. I made clear the purpose of my remarks. I uttered the words "honorably and dishonorably." I have no desire to continue this debate; neither have I any desire nor feeling to add to or reiterate what I stated. I wish to eliminate the word "dishonorably"; but in order to do that and express my thought, the word "honorably" must also be eliminated, and I wish to add these words:

Deprived you, Mr. Speaker, of delegates when Democratic public sentiment was in your favor.

That will complete the sense of the paragraph, and I ask unanimous consent to amend the RECORD in that way.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] asks unanimous consent to amend the RECORD in the manner stated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion to strike out the words.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5259) to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines between the United States and South America and between the United States and the countries of Europe, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. CRAWFORD as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 2642. An act authorizing the President to reinstate Joseph Elliot Austin as an ensign in the United States Navy.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21201) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916. Pending that motion, I

would like to see if we can agree upon the time for general debate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I have requests for about three hours. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOTT] wishes to make a speech, which he characterizes as his "swan song," a sort of farewell address to the House, which will take one hour. I know we all wish to hear him, and I have requests from other gentlemen for about two hours more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me, I think the way is clear to get the appropriation bills out of the way now before the 4th of March, if we get down to business. But it seems to me that six hours' general debate on this appropriation bill at this time would be an unusual amount of time. I have no desire to interfere with gentlemen making speeches; but I think if that latitude of debate is allowed, we ought to have a gentleman's understanding that we are going to stay here to-night and pass this bill.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think there is any objection to that.

Mr. MANN. Is there, so far as anyone knows, much debate asked for on the Military Academy bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not see the chairman of that committee in the Hall at this moment.

Mr. MANN. I should think we ought to be able to pass the diplomatic bill and the Military Academy bill by to-morrow night, and that will leave us in very good shape.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The fortifications bill will probably bring a good deal of debate on the bill. The debate now proposed is not on the bill.

Mr. MANN. We have a week and a half after this week. The deficiency bill usually does not take very long.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I suggest that this debate be limited to four hours, and that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] control two hours and a half of it and that I control one hour and a half.

Mr. COOPER. Very well, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this bill be limited to four hours, two hours and a half to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] and one hour and a half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill shall not exceed four hours, one hour and a half to be controlled by himself and two hours and a half by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PURCHASE OF SHIPS.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, before we go into the debate on the Diplomatic and Consular bill I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Speaker's table the shipping bill, which has come back from the Senate, and ask to agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (S. 5259) to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines between the United States and South America, and between the United States and the countries of Europe.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to take this bill from the Speaker's table and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce the conferees later.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The motion of Mr. FLOOD of Virginia was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, H. R. 21201, with Mr. LINTHICUM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21201) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday, in a discussion with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], I made reference to the child-labor laws of the State of Georgia.

At that time I read from a statement which had been prepared by the National Child Labor Committee and submitted by their agents at the hearings before the Committee on Labor on the child-labor bill. Those hearings were held in the spring of 1914, and the statement of the child-labor conditions and child-labor laws in the various States was of course of that date. Relying upon its accuracy, I discussed the Georgia child-labor law from the standpoint as disclosed in that statement.

I have had my attention called this morning to the fact that on August 14, 1914, the Georgia Legislature passed a bill which was approved and became a law, to go into effect January 1, 1915, and that that law provides a liberal, just, fair, and equitable regulation of the labor of children in that State. I did not know about it yesterday; I had not kept up with the laws of the States so closely as to follow these laws passed within a few months, and I relied entirely upon the statement of the National Child Labor Committee.

I am going to ask unanimous consent, in order to do justice to the State of Georgia, to insert in the RECORD this law recently passed in that State, and I congratulate the State of Georgia on having fallen into line with the progressive States of the Union in protecting little children against the exploitation of employers. It adds another reason for the passage of a Federal child-labor law, because the more States that adopt proper laws, the more reason for the few remaining States to be compelled to accept such laws.

The law I read last night was the Georgia statute passed in 1908, which was repealed by the act of August 14, 1914, to which my attention has just been called. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing the law of August 14, 1914.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the law referred to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, merely for the purpose of obtaining information I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether his information, which now appears to have been inaccurate, was obtained from the National Child Labor Association?

Mr. PALMER. Yes; I made the statement that I read from the report of the agents of the National Child Labor Committee, and that that report was made at a meeting of the Committee on Labor last spring, before this Georgia statute was passed. The report then was accurate.

Mr. MOORE. I asked the question not to embarrass the gentleman but merely to show that sometimes we do get inaccurate information from those who agitate these matters.

Mr. PALMER. Yes; and we get inaccurate information from other sources.

Mr. ADAIR. But this was not inaccurate at the time it was made.

Mr. PALMER. No; but it has since been made obsolete.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. What was the date of the last statute enacted by the State of Georgia?

Mr. PALMER. August 14, 1914.

Mr. COOPER. I will say that I had the same pamphlet, and I did not know until this morning that Georgia had passed this statute.

Mr. PALMER. The statement I read was made before the Georgia act was passed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The statute is as follows:

CHILD LABOR, REGULATING EMPLOYMENT OF.

No. 426.

An act regulating the employment of children; to provide for the issuance of certificates with reference to age and educational qualifications of children; the revocation of such certificates by the commissioner of labor; designating prohibited hours of labor for such children; making it the duty of the commissioner of labor and authorized assistants to enforce this act; making it a misdemeanor to violate the provisions of this act; and to repeal the act approved August 1, 1906, entitled "An act to regulate the employment of children in factories and manufacturing establishments in this State, and to provide for the punishments of violations of the regulations prescribed, and for other purposes," and which said act repealed is codified in sections 3143, 3144, 3145, 3146, 3147, 3148, and 3149 of the Code of Georgia of 1910, and for other purposes.

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Georgia, That no child under the age of 14 years shall be employed by, or permitted to work in or about any mill, factory, laundry, manufacturing establishment, or place of amusement; except that children over 12 years of age who have widowed mothers dependent upon them for support, or orphan children over 12 years of age dependent upon their own labor for support, may work in factories and manufactories; except that the foregoing provisions of this section shall not be applicable in instances specified and provided for in section 8 of this act.

SEC. 2. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That no child under 14 years and 6 months shall be employed or be permitted to work in any of the establishments or occupations mentioned in section 1, unless the person, firm, or corporation employing such child has and keeps on file accessible to the officials charged with the enforcement of this act, a certificate from the superintendent of schools in the county or city in which such child resides, that such child is not less than 14 years of age, has attended school for not less than 12 weeks of the 12 months preceding the date of issuance of such certificate; except that the foregoing provisions of this section shall not be applicable in instances specified and provided for in section 8 of this act.

SEC. 3. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the certificate mentioned in the foregoing section shall state the full name, date and place of birth of the child, with the name and address of the parent, guardian, or person sustaining the parental relationship to such child, and that the child has appeared before the officer, and satisfactory evidence submitted that the child is of legal age. Blank forms of these certificates shall be furnished by the commissioner of labor to the superintendent of schools in the respective cities and counties. A duplicate copy of each certificate shall be filed with the commissioner of labor within four days from its issuance. The commissioner of labor may at any time revoke any certificate if, in his judgment, the certificate was improperly issued. He is authorized to investigate the true age of any child employed, hear evidence, and require the production of relevant books or documents. If the certificate is revoked, the then employer shall be notified, and said child shall not thereafter be employed or permitted to labor until a new certificate has been legally obtained; except that the foregoing provisions of this section shall not be applicable in instances specified and provided for in section 8 of this act.

SEC. 4. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That no child under 14 years and 6 months of age shall be permitted to work in or about any of the establishments mentioned in section 1, or section 2, of this act, between the hours of 7 p. m. and 6 a. m., according to the standard time of the community in which such establishment is located.

SEC. 5. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That it shall be the duty of the commissioner of labor and his authorized assistants to see that the provisions of this act are enforced.

SEC. 6. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That any person, agent, or representative of any firm or corporation violating any of the provisions of this act; or any parent, guardian, or other person standing in parental relationship to any child, who shall hire or place for employment or labor, any child under the age limits in any of the establishments or occupations mentioned in section 1 of this act, or any superintendent of county or city schools who shall issue a certificate knowing that its issuance was illegal; or any person who shall knowingly furnish any untrue evidence with reference to the date or place of birth of said child, or the age of said child or its educational qualifications, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be punished accordingly.

SEC. 7. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the act approved August 1, 1906, and entitled "An act to regulate the employment of children in factories and manufacturing establishments in this State and to provide for the punishment of violations of the regulations prescribed, and for other purposes," and codified in sections 3143 to 3149, inclusive, of the Code of Georgia of 1910, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That it shall be lawful for a child 12 years of age or more to work in and for a mill, factory, laundry, manufacturing establishment or place of amusement if such child has dependent upon his labor a widowed mother or if such child is an orphan dependent upon his own labor. Whenever such child desires to work in any of such places as is specified above the fact that such child's labor is necessary to support a widowed mother or to support such orphan child must be found to be true after an investigation by a commission composed of the county school superintendent and the ordinary of the county where the work is to be done, and the head of the school in the school district where the said child lives. After an investigation by said commission, if it, or a majority of its members, find that the facts exist to authorize such child to work in or for any of the establishments mentioned in section 1 of this act, because of the existence of either of the conditions herebefore set out, such commission shall issue a certificate to that effect which shall be kept of file in the office of the establishment where said child is at work. Such commission shall make an investigation and issue a new certificate at least once each six months, and may prescribe as a condition precedent to issuance of such certificate school attendance for such length of time and at such time as in its discretion seems wise. No such certificate more than six months old shall authorize the employment of any child under 14½ years of age in or for any of the places specified in section 1 of this act.

SEC. 9. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act be, and they are hereby, repealed.

SEC. 10. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the provisions of this act shall be in force on and after January 1, 1915.

Approved August 14, 1914.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill carries a total of \$4,454,370.01. This is an increase over the present law of \$144,513, and is \$130,312 less than the estimate sent in by the executive department to Congress.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has labored earnestly to cut down appropriations in this bill to the least possible amount necessary to the proper conduct of our foreign service. I believe we have done it. We have decreased the following among other items:

Salaries of interpreters to embassies and legations, \$6,000.
International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, \$7,500.

Arbitration of pecuniary claims, \$40,870.

Waterways Treaty International Joint Commission, \$10,000.

I believe that all of these decreases are justified by evidence submitted to the Foreign Affairs Committee. Of course there are some items in the bill of last year that are not carried in this bill. Then we have increased certain items. We have in-

creased the salaries of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service \$31,500. That was due to the law which recently went into effect, known as the reorganization of the Diplomatic and Consular Service. That law necessitated an increase of \$31,500 for secretaries to embassies and legations.

Then there is an increase in contingent expenses and foreign missions, \$10,500, due to the fact that Argentina and Chile have been raised from legations to embassies.

We have increased the allowance for clerk hire in the United States consulates \$117,800. That increase was deemed wise. There are several reasons why this increase should be granted. One of the principal weaknesses of the Consular Service for several years has been the inadequate number of competent clerks employed. The work of the Consular Service has vastly increased, and to a great extent the increase has been of a character which requires a higher grade of clerical assistance than has heretofore been necessary. Moreover, an earnest attempt has been made to Americanize the subordinate force in the consulates, and to a considerable extent this has been done. It can not be carried on, however, unless a larger fund is placed at the disposal of the department for compensation, for it is obvious that a competent American clerk will not serve in the consulates abroad unless given compensation upon which he can live respectably. The amount now appropriated would provide only one clerk at \$1,250 a year for each office. It must be apparent that many consulates must have a number of clerks and that competent men who serve as vice consuls in the larger offices, and particularly when living expenses are high, can not be obtained for so small a sum.

Another reason for a larger and more competent force of subordinates is afforded by the complicated and onerous duties which the present war has placed upon consulates. The care of the interests and subjects of belligerent nations, safeguarding and protection of the commerce and shipping of the United States, the protection of American citizens—all require a vast amount of additional work. A considerable amount is being allowed for increased clerical assistance out of the special war appropriation made by Congress, but more will be required after that appropriation shall have been exhausted.

The conditions growing out of the war make it of the highest importance that a larger number of American citizens be employed as clerks in the consulates. In many places the services of clerks of foreign nationality have had to be dispensed with because of objections upon the part of foreign Governments. In replacing these clerks with Americans larger compensation will have to be paid, rendering a larger appropriation necessary.

We also incorporate an item of \$360,000 for the purchase of consular premises at Shanghai and \$2,275 for a similar purpose at Yokohama. There are some entirely new items in the bill. One is for a hundred thousand dollars for an exposition at Panama, which is to be held during the coming spring and summer. Twenty-five thousand dollars of this money will be used for an exhibit at this exposition and \$75,000 to erect a permanent building at Panama City. I will read Secretary Bryan's letter in reference to this item:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 20, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: I have made inquiries in regard to the Panama Exposition, about which you spoke to me a few days ago, and find that the exposition is to open on July 6, 1915. Its character is to be Latin American, and its purpose is to bring under one organization a series of permanent exhibits of products from Latin-American countries, so that travelers crossing the Isthmus may have an opportunity to inspect with a minimum of difficulty and expense the products of the various countries of Latin America.

The only exception to the purely Latin-American character of the exposition is the inclusion of Spain as an exhibitor. It is expected that Spain will spend some \$80,000 for the erection of a permanent building which, after the close of the exposition, will be used to house the legation and will contain a permanent exhibition of Spanish products and be the center of Spanish trade publicity in the Caribbean region.

It is understood that Cuba and Venezuela will also erect permanent buildings at the exposition. Cuba intends to spend about \$60,000 for a building, which will later on become the home of the Cuban Legation and contain a permanent exhibit of Cuban products. It is not known how much will be expended by Venezuela.

It is understood that Guatemala will spend perhaps \$25,000 on her exhibit, and Nicaragua, and probably other Latin-American countries, will be represented by displays of merchandise and other articles of their production.

Panama itself has already expended about \$650,000 on a permanent exhibit and upon buildings now under construction, which will be used in the future as Government offices.

The distinct Pan American character of the exposition makes it of the highest importance that the United States should take a conspicuous part in the exposition. It is obvious that a permanent exhibit of the United States on the Isthmus of Panama, which will be crossed by so many passengers interested in trade, in the near future, could not fail to stimulate interest in articles of American production, and the appropriation for American participation should be ample for the installation of a thoroughly comprehensive display of articles produced in the United States.

In view of the character of the exposition it would seem desirable that as much latitude as practicable be given to the expenditure of the money appropriated for the purpose, and I would suggest that if there should be no objection on the part of Congress the appropriation be made without limitation to any particular year, so that it may be expended during the entire period of the exposition, which conceivably may extend beyond the calendar year of 1915.

I am, my dear Mr. Flood,
Very sincerely, yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

Hon. HENRY D. FLOOD,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives.

There is an item of \$50,000 for a conference of American financiers and an authorization of the President to invite the financial secretaries of the South and Central American countries and leading bankers of these countries, not exceeding three from each country, to meet here with our Secretary of the Treasury in a conference, and authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to invite bankers of this country to meet with them. This is deemed very important by the executive department. I understand that the system of bills of exchange used by this country and those used by the South and Central American countries are different. This and other subjects will be discussed, so that proper commercial relations can be established between our country and the Republics to the south of us, and our commercial relations with those countries increased and strengthened. I desire to read Secretary McAdoo's letter on this subject:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 15, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: With the approval of the President, I submitted to the Secretary of State, on the 6th of November last, a suggestion that an invitation be extended to each of the Central and South American Governments to send to Washington its finance minister, or some duly accredited financier, for a conference with the Secretary of the Treasury, looking to an improvement in the financial relationship between the United States and the Central and South American countries, and that these Governments be invited, also, to send three representatives of the banking interests of each country to join in the conference. I also suggested that if the Central and South American Governments should be favorably disposed to the idea, the Secretary of the Treasury would invite representative American bankers to participate in the proposed conference. In my letter to the Secretary of State I expressed the conviction that improved financial relations between the Central and South American countries and the United States is of primary importance, and that the proposed conference would be productive of great good. The Secretary of State informs me that he has communicated with the various Governments concerned, and that the idea has been favorably received. I inclose a letter from the Secretary of State, bearing the approval of the President, suggesting the passage of a joint resolution authorizing the President to extend a formal invitation to the Central and South American Governments to participate in the proposed conference, and authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to invite representative American bankers to attend. For the purpose of entertaining the foreign conferees an appropriation of \$50,000 is requested.

The unusual conditions prevailing throughout the world to-day make the proposed step exceedingly timely, and it should result in greatly improving and strengthening our relations—financial, commercial, and social, with our neighboring Republics in Central and South America.

In my first letter to the President the suggested date of the conference was February 1, but in view of the unavoidable delays which have occurred in the meantime it will be necessary to fix a later date. The joint resolution, therefore, authorizes the President to call the conference at such a date as he may think advisable.

Permit me to suggest the desirability of prompt action in this matter, particularly in view of the fact that the various Governments with which the Secretary of State has already communicated have evinced a most cordial and friendly disposition in the matter.

Faithfully, yours,

W. G. McADOO.

Hon. HENRY D. FLOOD,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has considered all of these increases very carefully. The other items in the bill are the usual items carried in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill. I believe that this bill should be passed without amendment and without having any of these items stricken out on a point of order, and I hope such will be the pleasure of the committee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOLT].

Mr. BARTHOLOLT. Mr. Chairman, permit me to remark at the outset that what I am going to say has no reference whatever to a situation in which our own country may be involved.

In discussing the affairs of the Nation on this floor we find our task on some occasions more weighty with responsibility than on others. This is true with me at this particular time, when I undertake to discuss from an American viewpoint the situation in this country resulting from the great European war. I do not know whether I am equal to the task, but, mindful of all real obligations of neutrality, I shall confine myself to such matters in which my judgment can claim at least a modest degree of competence. And as this will probably be the last time I shall have the honor to address the House I crave the attention of my colleagues.

The United States has a composite population. Not England alone, but all Europe is its mother, and contributions to the blood which now circulates through the Nation's veins have been made by practically all countries, the largest share next to Great Britain having been contributed by Germany or the States now constituting the German Empire. American statesmen recognized early in our history that ours was not a ready-made nation, but a "nation to be" whose character was to be shaped by the impress made upon it by the various elements constituting its growing population. It was also recognized that Saul could not at once turn into Paul, that the newcomer could not change his traits overnight. It is probably true that the Anglo-Saxon is less free from racial or national prejudices than the cosmopolitan German—a strange phenomenon, for they come from the same cradle—yet such was the tolerance of our older statesmen that they never regarded the love of the immigrant for the old country as in any wise irreconcilable with his allegiance to the new. And why? Because reverence for the mother never detracts from love for the bride, and, furthermore, because that reverence is a natural impulse which can no more be regulated or controlled than can the throbs of the human heart. We can educate an immigrant in our way of thinking, induce him to adopt our customs and make a good American citizen of him, but we can not change his heart to the extent of eradicating his regard for his native land. Along with freedom of thought and conscience we must grant him the liberty of placing his sympathies and affections where he pleases. It is a natural right which no law can limit and no government can deny him as long as our own country is not involved. American statesmanship had the choice of either closing the gates of the country or of taking its chances with the constant human influx. It chose the latter course, and history does not record a single instance to prove that policy to have been a mistake. While the people of the United States have been gathered from all nooks and corners of the globe, while many of them still differ in habits, customs, and language, and while on occasions the sympathies of the first, second, and even third generations still go out to the land of their ancestors, no serious problem has thereby been created. Our adopted citizens and their native descendants have stood the test of loyalty in every crisis in the country's history, and thus irrefutable proof has been adduced that memories of the fatherland conjured up by impulses of the heart do not and will not detract from the allegiance due to the adopted country. [Applause.]

I ask you to keep this essential point in mind when I proceed to define the attitude in the present crisis of one great element of our population, that of the American citizens of German blood. Owing to press denunciations they are entitled to a hearing, and therefore it is incumbent upon some one familiar with their sentiments and aspirations to interpret these sentiments for the information of this House and the country. I shall not discuss the war, either as to its causes or the merits of the contentions of either party, but confine myself strictly to American or home issues which now confront us in consequence of the stupendous struggle. Because of their sympathies with the fatherland, the Americans of German descent have been openly accused of divided allegiance and downright disloyalty. They know this wanton insult to emanate from English and French press agents, and consequently treat it with the contempt it deserves. But what they resent is that, in the face of our own history, the American press should have opened its columns to such calumnies. Germans have fought and bled on the battle fields of four American wars and furnished a larger proportion to the fighting strength of our country than any other of the so-called foreign elements. In the Revolutionary War, with Baron Steuben they espoused the cause of the Colonies, and the implicit confidence which the Father of our Country placed in their loyalty is a matter of history. In 1861, when many of the English, with instinctive aversion to American naturalization, took out British protection papers, the Germans—that is, nearly 200,000 of them—rallied around the flag of Abraham Lincoln to save the Union. They displayed the same valor in the War of 1812 and in the Spanish-American War, and their loyalty to the flag in times of war is equaled only by their loyalty to American ideals in times of peace. [Applause.] I should have much preferred if just at this time these historical truths had been uttered by other than a German-American tongue; but while our pro-English press is ignoring them, Americans of German blood should at least have expected immunity from libels and insults. Yet such insults are heaped upon that element by newspapers permitting agents of the allies to use their space for that purpose. We can best judge the future by the past, and the lessons of the past justify me in proclaiming it as an irrefutable fact that if unfortunately the United States should ever again be embroiled in war, which

the Heavens forbid, the Germans of this country would again as loyally rally around the Stars and Stripes as they did against our enemies in every crisis of the past. [Applause.] Let me again assert in most positive terms what I said on the floor the other day, that the Germans are for America against England, for America against Germany, for America against the world! They will never waver for one second in their allegiance to the land of their choice and adoption. [Applause.]

These few words will suffice, I trust, to lay bare the charge above referred to in its whole naked infamy. But let me proceed with my argument. If sympathy for Germany is an evidence of disloyalty, as is claimed by our traducers, you will agree that sympathy for the allies is exactly the same thing; and if that be true, we would be confronted with the monstrous fact that the whole American press printed in English, with but few exceptions, is disloyal to the United States. It is absurd, of course, but I make this deduction merely to show that I am not a less patriotic American by sympathizing with the fatherland and its ally than I would be if my sympathies were for England and her allies; and certainly no true American will claim that to side with England and to oppose Germany is a prerequisite of loyal American citizenship, for that would mean both trucking to a former enemy and the betrayal of a traditional friend, a course absolutely unjustifiable by any standard of American loyalty.

There is no question, Mr. Chairman, but what at the present time the Germans of this country are stirred as they were never stirred before. Their state of mind manifests itself in great mass meetings and in hundreds of thousands of petitions addressed to Congress in favor of an embargo on arms. It would not be quite correct, however, to ascribe the prevailing excitement solely to sympathy for Germany. In reality it is as much, if not more, injured pride and an outraged sense of justice which have caused their indignation to rise because of the outrageous prevarications of truth and the cruel misrepresentations of Germany, her people, and institutions contained in the manufactured news from England and reprinted in the American newspapers. Proud of their American citizenship, they have in a political sense absolutely nothing in common with Germany or its government, but their more or less accurate knowledge of conditions in that country taught them that the alleged news we were getting was a brutal attempt at defamation to poison the American mind against Germany. The war was started with a monstrous lie, and in order to support it a thousand other lies had to be told. The Germans were denounced as Huns and barbarians, as ravishers and plunderers, and as perpetrators of the worst imaginable atrocities. The Emperor was described as an Attila, who on one day had had 110 Socialist deputies executed; the Crown Prince as a thief, and so forth. You might say that it is natural for enemies to revile each other, but I must answer that, so far as Germany is concerned, she herself, though obliged to fight the lie as one of the worst of her many enemies, has not yet stooped to a departure from the truth either in her own newspapers or in the messages she has sent out to the world. And permit me to add parenthetically that to the neutral world the present struggle has an enhanced significance in that it is also a warfare of falsehood against the truth. If the international lie should succeed, I believe the world would eventually suffocate in its slime.

The Germans of this country could understand why England to secure recruits should want to incite her own people by these falsehoods, but they could not understand nor will they forgive the American newspapers for reprinting them in our country. To do so was a most serious and an unpardonable reflection on the German element of this country. As an integral part of the American people, whose characteristics and virtues are reflected as much in the composite character of this Nation as are those of the citizens of English descent, they believed themselves to be entitled to some consideration at the hands of the press of their own country. Such consideration was denied them, however, and with utter disregard of their feelings they were rudely informed that their brothers on the other side of the ocean are barbarians, ghouls, and vandals, and that is not all. From the first day of the war up to the present whatever the allies did was all right, while every act of the Germans was all wrong, even if it was an exactly similar thing; for instance, the dropping of explosives from aeroplanes. The alleged violation of Belgian neutrality was harped upon with sickening persistence even after it had been ascertained that the neutrality treaty had expired in 1872, and that, if it had still been in force, the Belgian Government had itself thrown it overboard by its secret agreement with England regarding the landing of English troops on Belgian soil. On the other hand, not a word is said about the violation of Chinese neutrality by Japanese and English troops, although

this matter is of infinitely greater consequence to American interests than the affairs of Belgium can possibly be. The present international status of China is due to the skill of American statesmanship, it being an achievement of John Hay, made possible by the support of Germany alone. The integrity of China, already violated by England and her ally, should be restored and maintained at all hazards, but we look in vain for any appeals in the press in favor of the conservation of American interests in that quarter. It might embarrass England, you know, if just now the press insisted on our own rights. As to Belgian atrocities, five American newspaper men of the highest standing affirmed under oath that there was no such thing, yet these alleged atrocities are presented to American readers in glaring headlines, while the authentic refutation of the stories is published in small type on the sixteenth or seventeenth page. We may be foolish, but we are not blind to such notorious evidences of partiality. The Americans of German blood are a unit in bitterly resenting not only these unneutral efforts to poison the fountainheads of American public opinion against Germany but also the palpably unneutral "most-favored-nation" treatment systematically accorded to Great Britain. Touching the last-named fact, it seems to them as if we were using kid gloves against England and the mailed fist against Germany, as if, indeed, everything was being avoided, even to the disregard of American interests, that might embarrass the former country in her effort to crush Germany.

The bill of complaints is too long to recite here in full, but let me merely ask: Have we protested against American citizens having been dragged from neutral steamers and thrown into English prisons simply because those men, Americans to the manner born, happened to bear German names? No. Have we protested against England's inhuman policy to starve to death the noncombatant population of Germany by stopping, in open violation of international law, all food supplies, even if carried from a neutral country and in neutral bottoms? No. Have we protested against England declaring the whole North Sea as a war zone? No; but when Germany did the same thing in practically the same language we immediately dispatched a stiff note to Berlin, while the milder one was directed to England, though it would seem that the latter country was the chief offender in allowing the use of false flags. However, whatever the administration does in foreign affairs, as Americans it will be our duty to uphold it.

After this explanation can you understand, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, why the German mind in this country is agitated, and can you blame that element if their feelings are ruffled? When, moreover, it dawned upon them that all our arms factories were running night and day to supply the allies with weapons for use against their brothers and kinsmen, nothing could convince them that the United States was not actually a silent partner of the allies. Then it was that they demanded, and they are still demanding an embargo on arms to enforce honest neutrality, the kind of neutrality which the President proclaimed when he said: "We should be neutral in fact as well as in name, and should put a curb on every transaction which might be construed as giving a preference to one party to the struggle above another." This shameful traffic in arms, they argue, gives the lie to our prayers for peace, because it tends to prolong the war, and its permission by international law, they believe, imposes no obligation on our citizens to carry it on, no more on us than on the other neutral countries which have all stopped it upon the demand of England herself. I should like to discuss this important question at length, if my time permitted, but let me say just one more word. Whether the President would use the authority or not, there ought to be a law on our statute books which confers such authority upon him in order that he might enforce his demands for a free and open sea and unrestricted commerce in noncontraband goods. In our present demands against England our only alternative is to either give in or declare war. The threat of an embargo on arms, however, would quickly bring the "Mistress of the Seas" to terms and without war. Hence the legislation demanded by what the pro-English press is pleased to call German mass meetings, will be a preventive of, rather than a provocation to, war with England, and thus fails to the ground another of the silly charges preferred by the press bureau of the allies against me and the several millions of American citizens who think as I do on this subject.

Continuing as an interpreter of the feelings of these millions, all good American citizens, permit me to say that the hostility of the Anglo-American press against Germany and the Germans has forced many to a conclusion which, if correct, would be the most painful disappointment of my life. They believe this attitude to be less pro-English than anti-German, and, indeed, regard it as the outgrowth of racial preju-

dice against the Germans even of this country, and as a revival of the old know-nothing spirit which aimed at a sort of guardianship by those of English descent over this country, to the exclusion of all other elements, the latter to be classed simply as "foreigners," and degraded to the rank of second-class citizens. How could such a conclusion be reached? Well, they ask whether the history of the American Germans has not been an honorable one. They fought for independence, opposed slavery, and loyally gave their bodies and lives that the Union might live; they were almost a unit for sound money, and are imbued with the true American spirit of freedom to such an extent that they love liberty better than whatever good might come from its restriction. As a rule, they modestly refrained from seeking political preferment, but filled America's life with music and song and innocent social pleasures. They are peaceful and law-abiding citizens, who by industry and thrift have made the best of the opportunities which the country of their choice generously offered them, and thus they have contributed their honest share to the growth, the development, and the grandeur of the Republic. [Applause.] If such a record of good citizenship is not sufficient, it is argued, to insure the German element immunity from libels and insults, what else can account for it but racial aversion, the innate prejudice of the Anglo-Saxon against everything foreign?

Another argument: Why, it is asked, with intense seriousness, do American newspapers repeat and accept at par all the pretexts which England hurriedly invented for waging war against Germany, such as "The small States must be protected," "German militarism must be crushed," and so forth? Should not an American, free, neutral, and independent, form his own judgment rather than blindly accept the logic of a belligerent? Does not the proverbial American sense of justice and fair play require us to impartially hear both sides before we render our verdict? Every schoolboy knows the kind of protection England has afforded to smaller States. It is the kind which the spider gives to the fly. And then German militarism! As pacifists we can condemn it along with Russian, French, and English militarism, but of these the German military system is the least objectionable, because, never having been used for a war of conquest, it has been nothing more than a bulwark of national defense, of which every young man of military age feels it a duty and an honor to be a part.

For hundreds of years German soil has been the battle ground of all great European wars, and the poor people of that country suffered as the Belgians, the Russian Jews, and others suffer to-day, only that nobody sympathized with them. Finally they united for self-defense and self-preservation, and out of the smoke and fire of the Franco-German War emerged, as a realization of their fervent hopes and earlier dreams, the United States of Germany. But for the more lasting enjoyment of the blessings of peace the new German Empire combined with Austria-Hungary and Italy, the three forming the Triple Alliance for mutual protection and defence. In spite of her much-decried militarism Germany has kept the peace for 45 years, and she would to-day enjoy the fruits of her peaceful development and consequent prosperity if it had not been for the combined lust of conquest, lust of revenge, and jealousy of the three powers which are now trying to crush her. This is the story of German militarism. But, say my friends, when we relate this story we are cried down and given to understand that our very knowledge of these details is treason, because it shows that we pay attention to other than American interests.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we must admit that Germany is not getting a square deal from us, that she is to be condemned, right or wrong. The reasons are a psychological riddle, which has distressed me more than anything I ever experienced in my life, the more so because Germany has been our consistent and faithful friend from the beginning of our history. Carl Schurz, as long as 60 years ago, wrote to his friend Kinkel:

It is my belief that the future interests of America and Germany are closely interwoven. However different the two nations may be in character, they will have the same opponents, and that will compel them to have a corresponding foreign policy. America's influence in Europe will be based on Germany, and Germany's world position will depend essentially on the success of America. Germany is the only power in Europe whose interests will not conflict with those of America, and America is the only power in the civilized world that would not be jealous of a strong united Germany. They can both grow without being rivals, and it will be to the interest of each to keep the adversaries of the other in check.

When this was written, in 1855, Japan was not yet a world power, England had not yet tried to help break up the Union, and Germany had not yet had the opportunity to befriend us as signally as she did during the Civil War. Hence, if this was true 60 years ago, it is even more so to-day. And in this connection let me again quote Carl Schurz. In 1903 Pomeroy Bur-

ton had asked him about the possibility of a war with Germany, and this was his answer:

A war between the United States and Germany would be so awful, so incalculable a calamity, that only the most absolute and evident necessity could serve as an excuse for it. Not even the wildest jingo on either side will pretend that such a necessity exists or is in prospect. In fact, there is no real question of difference between the two countries important enough to disturb their ancient friendship. A war between them would, therefore, not only be criminal, but idiotic—an absurd atrocity, a murderous nonsense. Even to suggest the possibility of such a war under such circumstances and to agitate the public mind by such suggestions is a piece of mischievous recklessness.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, before I digressed I was discussing the opinions of those who are inclined to ascribe the cause of the anti-German feeling in our country to racial prejudice. The counterfeeling ran high, as we all know, but I concluded that, even if there were some truth in that supposition, it must not be countenanced. If others wished to act in an un-American spirit, let them do so; the Germans, at least, should remain squarely on American ground and totally ignore every display of narrowness which, detestable in itself, would create a schism in this country and, if allowed to grow, eventually rend it asunder. There should never be a division in the United States upon racial or national lines. Russia, by using Serbia as a tool, has sown the seed of discord between the different races in Austria-Hungary, and we see what it has led to. Under the American sun, in their capacity as citizens, the Teuton and the Slav, the Irishman and the Englishman, the German and the Frenchman extend to each other the hand of brotherhood as equals, and the great flag covers them all. [Applause.] Ancient prejudices have melted away under the sun of freedom until, no longer English, Irish, German, Scandinavian, we are, one and all, heart and soul, Americans! [Applause.]

I believe this to be the true sentiment of all citizens of German blood; and in justice to them it should be said further that in the present crisis they would not have been heard from but for the provocation caused by the outspoken unneutral attitude of the pro-English press and the sales exclusively to Germany's enemies of arms and ammunition. It was easy to direct the movement started by them into loyal American channels, and that, Mr. Chairman, was the purpose of the conference recently held here in Washington. It was a most remarkable gathering. Although Americans of German blood largely predominated, it was not a pro-German, but decidedly a pro-American, meeting, as it was intended to be. Those present were distinguished representatives; in most cases the heads of the great church and civic organizations of all parts of the country; and probably for the first time in our history Republicans and Democrats, Jews and Gentiles, Catholics, Protestants, and Free Thinkers shook hands for a common purpose, and that purpose was to call for an enforcement, in accordance with the spirit of American patriotism, of every American right against all belligerents alike, and to insist on the observance of strict and genuine neutrality as defined by all American Presidents from George Washington to Woodrow Wilson. As plainly indicated by its complexion, the gathering was strictly nonpartisan; and that, too, will be the character of the national organization to be effected as a result of that historic conference. After many hours of earnest deliberation, during which all the speakers displayed a most admirable feeling of restraint, as well as of solemn responsibility, a "declaration of principles," formulated by the platform committee, was adopted by a unanimous vote, and I leave it to the House to say whether this declaration rings true or not. Here it is:

Whereas the spirit of absolute neutrality toward foreign nations at war with one another is a basic tradition of the American people; and
Whereas the course of recent events has made it evident that this cherished attitude has been endangered through a foreign control of our news service and of our communication by sea; and
Whereas our commerce and our citizens have been compelled to endure violation of the principles of international law; and
Whereas the ships of our country in common with those of other neutral nations, having on board the property of citizens of the United States, have been arrested on the high seas by a belligerent power, conveyed into its port and there subjected to a process of search involving delays and losses; and
Whereas citizens of the United States and of nations friendly to us have forcibly been taken off our ships in defiance of the protection accorded them by the American flag and put into prison or detention camps; and
Whereas articles hitherto considered absolutely free in international traffic have been arbitrarily made contraband; and
Whereas the rules of international law governing neutral commerce have been altered or disregarded in the special interest of one set of belligerents to the manifest injury of the United States as an independent Nation with rights to be respected and with citizens to protect; and
Whereas the shipment of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war under conditions now prevailing is unfair, unneutral, and in violation of America's ethical ideas, tends to prolong the war, and is irreconcilable with our prayers for peace; and

Whereas this condition of affairs is intolerable to all American citizens who believe in the principles of neutrality, fairness, and friendship applied to all nations alike, and in the noble mission of this country as a promoter of peace and a champion of justice and humanity: Therefore, in order to reestablish genuine American neutrality and to uphold it free from commercial, financial, and political subservience to foreign powers, be it

Resolved, That we, citizens of the United States, agree to effect a national organization the objects and purposes of which may be stated as follows:

1. In order to assure the possession of an independent news service, we favor an American cable controlled by the Government of the United States
2. We demand a free and open sea for the commerce of the United States and unrestricted traffic in noncontraband goods as defined by international law.
3. We favor as a strictly American policy the immediate enactment of legislation prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war.
4. We favor the establishment of an American merchant marine.
5. We pledge ourselves individually and collectively to support only such candidates for public office, irrespective of party, who will place American interests above those of any other country, and who will aid in eliminating all undue foreign influences from American life.

Mr. Chairman, this declaration hardly needs an explanation at my hands. That it is a truly American platform, and one on which all good and loyal citizens can stand, will be admitted by all whose judgment is not blinded by prejudice and partiality. Yet the pro-English newspapers, especially those of New York, denounced it in unmeasured terms. With blind fury they rushed to the defense of British interests, against these so-called hyphenated Americans, foreigners, and traitors who have the temerity to assert American rights at such an inconvenient time. The climax was reached by one of the great metropolitan dailies deliberately reversing the position which the conference took with regard to American and foreign interests. I can not resist the temptation to nail this instructive evidence of jugglery to the masthead. As we have seen, the last plank of the platform reads:

We pledge ourselves . . . to support only such candidates for public office, irrespective of party, who will place American interests above those of any other country.

But the newspaper just mentioned puts it this way editorially:

When the representatives of German-American societies publicly pledge themselves in effect to oppose all candidates for office who will not sacrifice American interests to German interests they are straining American patience to the breaking point.

This is the kind of journalism, Mr. Chairman, that we protest against from the standpoint of simple honesty. It is but a sample of the newspaper war which is being waged against Germany, too. Most of the comments might just as well have been written in London. The injustice of it all is solely responsible for whatever bitterness and indignation there may exist among those who believe in a square deal for Germany. American citizens of German blood simply refuse to accept the judgment of the English censor on the country of their fathers, because they know better; and when that judgment is presented to them by the newspapers of their own country, they protest because it does violence to the truth; and he would be a poor American, indeed, who would not stand up for right and truth rather than falsehood and wrong. As between the two he can not afford to be neutral. In order to guard against misrepresentations of our country, if ever we should be at outs with the country that now controls the news service of the world, an independent American cable, to be owned and controlled by the Government, is demanded as the first plank of the platform referred to. The other planks speak for themselves.

In conclusion let me reiterate the steadfast devotion of all citizens of German blood to American ideals and the flag. Impatient of injustice though they be, their hearts are true to the core. They feel themselves as one with every other citizen of the Republic, and, right or wrong, they will share the fate of their adopted country and of their children's fatherland. Whatever their secondary sympathies may be, they are with all other true Americans for America first, last, and all the time. [Applause.] They are for a united Nation, and shall ever uphold the ideal of national unity and dignity with that loyalty which has characterized their whole history on American soil.

I thank you for your patience and attention. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman from Missouri consume?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] for half a minute.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a speech delivered by Mr. Charles S. Hamlin, governor of the Federal Reserve Board, before the Chicago real estate board on February 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to print in the Record the speech referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I expect to talk about war conditions for a few minutes, but it is certainly not my purpose to refer to that extraordinary, unparalleled horror in Europe. I believe that in His generosity the Lord has provided soil enough and conditions good enough for all of the people in the world to find a place in the sun, and, so far as my feeble abilities enable me to contribute to the bringing of that about, I propose to do so. I mean to speak a word about purely American matters. I shall refer to conditions in that part of the world which more directly concerns us. I do not believe that the Lord has commissioned us to administer the affairs of the Spanish-American countries about which I shall speak, but He has made them our neighbors, and what they do and how they do it does concern us. There exists to-day a most unfortunate state of affairs in the neighboring Republic of Mexico. For four years or more a carnival of crime has gone on in that country. It has become a huge international scandal. It is a political sore which, if not healed, may infect both the South and North American Continents.

In that country, where patriotic movements are always violent, there are large numbers who protest their love of the constitution, a document to which their devotion is shown in some very peculiar ways. One band of—well, I will say one army after another, in order to speak in diplomatic language—has gone about the great area embraced in that Republic and done deeds which the conscience of no good man can approve. It has made a condition on the frontier which is dangerous, a condition which I am afraid may precipitate us into war at any time. I am submitting a plan which I believe will clear that situation up.

The President declared in his Indianapolis speech, and I perfectly agree with him in the statement, that it is none of our business how they—the Mexicans—go about their business or how long they take in determining it. That is true within limitations, and provided they do not trespass upon our rights and make conditions which will render war between us and them inevitable, and which I certainly hope will be avoided. The President also said it is none of our business how they go about their business. That raises another question, and I regret to say I can not agree with the President of the United States in that respect.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is a perfectly simple and easy matter to avoid any conflict at arms with Mexico or with any other part of the Spanish-American peoples. I believe that if we make concessions of a reasonable sort, that if we meet them in the right spirit, if we freely recognize the absolute equality of sovereignty, the sovereignty of the big and the sovereignty of the little States, we may bring about conditions which will not only restore quiet to Mexico, but which will prevent a recurrence of such trouble, and it will certainly keep us out of any possibility of trouble with any people in that part of the world hereafter. And to that end, Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks by printing in the Record an article which I prepared and which was published in the current issue of the American Journal of International Law. It suggests a Pan-American agreement which is as practical as it is pacific. Mr. Chairman, before I take my seat I want to say one word and pay one small tribute to the character of the people who were referred to so truthfully and so eloquently by my friend from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOTT], who has just taken his seat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Can the gentleman from Virginia yield me another minute?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman asked for three minutes and I yielded him five.

Mr. COOPER. I will yield one minute to the gentleman.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to say just a word: I have the honor, and I am proud to be able to say it, of representing a large constituency commonly referred to as German-Americans. There is no more robustly American or patriotic people in this country than the constituency which I represent, and everything the gentleman from Missouri has said as to their thrift, their integrity, their enterprise, and their usefulness as citizens,

I cordially indorse. In those counties in my district which are referred to as German counties there are no delinquent taxpayers. The criminal court has no business to do when it meets. They are law-abiding, industrious, useful, and patriotic citizens, and I am glad to have the opportunity to say so in these days of excited and foolish talk. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the article referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The article referred to is as follows:

THE A B C MEDIATION.
[By JAMES L. SLAYDEN.]

"How to regulate social, political, and commercial intercourse between the people and Government of the United States and the peoples and Governments of the other Republics on the American Continent so as to establish and maintain perfect cordiality and mutual confidence and respect, is a problem which has never been satisfactorily solved.

"In considering this question, which is often to the front and sometimes discussed with acerbity, certain disagreeable facts must be faced. In the process of understanding it American vanity will be hurt, but that is no reason for avoiding the effort to do so. There is abundant reason for believing that Americans are not popular in Mexico and other Latin-American countries. It is not the purpose of the writer in this brief essay to undertake to show why this is so. Suffice it to say that the people of the United States are viewed with suspicion, and this doubt of them and their purposes has militated against the development of American trade in the southern Republics, and is a cause of irritation which ought to be cured. Diplomatic friendship has existed and does exist, but that is a relationship which can always be counted on until an open breach is imminent. Less than 30 days before the outbreak of the greatest war in all history there was an assumed—a diplomatic—cordiality between the monarchs of Russia, England, Germany, and Austria. There is no danger of a cataclysm in America such as is deluging Europe with blood; but that unparalleled disaster shows that something more than formal friendships, something far more than diplomatic amenities, is desirable in the intercourse of nations.

"The right relations are based in justice, in respect for the rights and views of other countries, and in forbearance. These are elemental international virtues that must be cultivated if cordial relations are to be maintained. They are the antidotes for the poison of doubt and suspicion.

"For four years Mexico has been cursed by one revolution after another, and conditions in that unhappy country have gone from bad to worse. There has been a vociferous demand for intervention by the United States. This demand has come from citizens of the United States residing or doing business in Mexico and from other sources. It has been assumed by these citizens and by some Governments that it is the duty and the right of the United States to interfere in Mexico to command the peace.

"Against great pressure two Presidents of the United States have declined to intervene, although Americans and Europeans, supposedly under the protection of our Government, have been plundered and murdered. The civilized world has looked to this country for relief from Mexican anarchy. The fact that no intervention has occurred—except in one instance and for the specific purpose of resenting an insult to the American flag—should convince the people of Spanish America that neither the people nor Government of the United States desire to meddle in the domestic affairs of other countries.

"Of course, there are circumstances under which intervention may become necessary. When treaty rights are not respected, or when the property of aliens is destroyed and their lives taken, their Governments may interpose even with armed forces. Under such conditions intervention would be justified in the custom of nations and approved by all civilized powers.

"Although apt to lead to it, intervention is sometimes undertaken to prevent war, and is justified as a restraint of wrongdoing and illegal or immoral acts.

"While these provocations have all no doubt existed, the United States, the big brother of the family of the American Republics, has so far refused to undertake the task of restoring order in Mexico.

"But is there not a better, a less expensive, and more effective way of extending protection to aliens in Mexico than armed intervention by a single power? The writer believes that there is, and two recent precedents may be cited. In one of these instances, the intervention in China in 1900, the plan was completely successful, and in the other it was partially so. In the Chinese intervention, made jointly by the United States and

sundry European Governments, the issue was a happy one for everybody, even for China herself.

"But it is to the situation in Mexico and the effort at mediation proposed by the ambassadors from Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, that specific reference is now made with the hope of indicating its value as a means for the preservation of peace.

"And here it may be well to say that the Mexican situation presents a purely American question, and must be settled by the Governments of the American continent.

"Everyone would like to see Mexico herself quickly and completely settle her internal troubles and avoid all interference from any other country or association of countries. But what if she will not, or can not? Shall intervention be by the United States alone, which will mean war and a new crop of suspicion and hatred of the Anglo-Saxon, or shall it be in association with the orderly Spanish-American countries? In the latter case the futility of resistance will be apparent, and quick and peaceful solution will certainly follow.

"Unfortunately all the details of the work done at Niagara are not known to the general public, and a correct estimate of its importance is difficult. But enough is known to suggest that the precedent is likely to become of transcendent importance in the political future of the American continent.

"The 'A. B. C.' mediation has taken its place in history, and in the opinion of the writer will be fully justified in the future. Certainly it was not a failure, and the more it is studied the stronger becomes the impression that it begins a diplomatic epoch in the history of the Americas.

"In their communication to the Secretary of State of the United States tendering good offices, the three ambassadors said that they did so 'for the purpose of serving the interest of peace and civilization on our continent, and with the earnest desire to prevent any further bloodshed to the prejudice of the cordiality and union which have always surrounded the relations of the Governments and the peoples of America.'

"It was a noble purpose, opportunely undertaken, and while never dramatic was in an important way successful. A war between the United States and Mexico then seemed imminent, and none occurred. A condition which was fast bringing ruin to Mexico, as it had brought shame, was distinctly and promptly bettered, and for some time thereafter there was no 'further bloodshed' in that unhappy country.

"To many students of the Niagara mediation it appears to have two distinct features of value. It helped, though possibly in a minor way, to bring the belligerents in Mexico into communication with one another, and it certainly made them realize that other countries were not indifferent to conditions in that Republic. It made them understand that chaos and bloodshed would not be permitted to go on forever. It compelled the Mexicans to realize that if they are to keep their sovereignty they must behave as a sovereign should, and not maintain an international nuisance. It forced them to think, and there was no more important fighting between the insurgents and the Huerta administration after the mediators met. Occasional minor conflicts between the followers of irresponsible guerilla chiefs and the military are not chargeable to Huerta or Carranza, and they may still be expected, for banditry of long standing is never ended in a day. Indians who have tasted the free, wild life of the camp, the companionship of a horse and a rifle, and an opportunity for loot and vengeance do not willingly or immediately go back to herding sheep or digging in mines.

"The second and by far the greatest value of the Niagara conference is the precedent it made. It points the way to the settlement of similar troubles in the future. It may, I think, be regarded as the beginning of a Pan American policy for the quieting of internal troubles and international disputes between the Republics on this continent.

"The proof it gave to the suspicious and doubtful citizens of the 20 Spanish and Portuguese speaking Republics that the people and Government of the United States contemplate no assault on their sovereignty and territory sufficed in itself to lift the mediation out of the class of failures. It did not accomplish all that some people believed it would or all that some of us hoped it might; but, in spite of the jeers of unsympathetic newspaper wits and the scorn of militarists, it did enough to establish a policy. Hereafter when any American country gives itself over to anarchy, those governments that prefer order to disorder, following the precedent of the 'A. B. C.' mediation, can jointly intervene to command the peace. If necessary to enforce this command, the military arm of all or a majority of the peaceable countries of America may be employed for that purpose. Under these joint operations no great financial burden will be put on any one peacemaker, and, better still, there can be no suspicion of motives, no apprehension of a loss of territory.

"That the people of Mexico, Central, and South America have entertained feelings of hostility toward this country, and a suspicion of its political purposes, is well known to observant travelers in those countries. The Mexican War of 1846, the exercise of overlordship in Santo Domingo and Haiti, 'dollar diplomacy' in Nicaragua and elsewhere, are all pointed to as reasons for this suspicion. The talk of some Americans of 'manifest destiny,' with its echo in the press, and the suggestion that the United States must, because of its ownership of the Panama Canal, control all territory down to the Isthmus, have not tended to remove that suspicion. South and Central Americans quite naturally say that the same reasoning applies to the territory south of the canal, and is equally valid.

"Such talk and the suspicion it has created have unquestionably interfered with the development of American trade in all Spanish America. It is human nature not to be inclined to favor, in trade or otherwise, people whose purposes are thought to be unfriendly. This feeling was perceptibly allayed by the proceedings at Niagara, and that, with the valuable precedent established, are distinct gains from the 'A. B. C.' mediation. Overlordship, so offensive to these Central and South Americans, was inferentially disclaimed, and the President and the Secretary of State made it perfectly clear that all this Government wants of its continental neighbors is friendship and mutual trade opportunities.

"The great and epoch-making speech of Mr. Wilson at Mobile cleared the atmosphere and made the mediation possible. That was a great and statesmanlike speech; but alone it was not sufficient to remove hurtful doubt and suspicion. It needed the persistent and sincere efforts of the Secretary of State, whose work for peace has given him an eminent and enviable place in history, and the prompt and hearty agreement to the mediation proposal to accomplish that.

"The way is now open for the future settlement of these revolutionary disturbances, the frequency and character of which have been a disgrace to the republican system of government. Why shall we not make the work begun at Niagara a permanent Pan American policy? Something like it worked very well in China at the time of the Boxer movement. There was no seizure of territory after the joint movement to Peking. But who can doubt that if the task of rescuing the legations had been left to any one of the great powers of Europe or to Japan China would have paid for it with a big slice of her territory?

"In the opinion of many earnest advocates of peace who feel a profound interest in all the American Governments this plan, if mutually agreed upon and carried into effect, would go far to remove this continent from the theater of possible war and would be a long step toward universal peace. It would put an end to the persistent clamor for armed intervention in Mexico by the United States. It would take the sting out of intervention and more quickly and effectively accomplish all that could be expected from the most successful interference with arms by any one country. It would give a sense of relief and territorial security to the smaller Latin-American countries, and, as all the larger and more powerful Governments declare themselves supporters of the policy of peace and justice, it is hard to see how they could object to it.

"It is in line with the peace plan of Mr. Secretary Bryan and keeps step with the doctrine of The Hague—the doctrine of arbitration, which in theory all good men indorse. A Pan American policy of mediation and arbitration whenever disturbances shall unfortunately occur ought to convert what has been until recently one of the most turbulent sections of the earth into a region of peace and prosperity.

"There is one distinct and mutual benefit to be shared by all the Governments of the American continent sure to follow the establishment of sincerely cordial relations between them. It will strengthen them for resistance in the event of an assault on the sovereignty or territory of any of them by any or all the powers waved off by President Monroe in 1823. That will amount to an understanding for mutual defense among 175,000,000 people on one continent flanked on all sides by the world's greatest oceans."

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman from Virginia occupy some more time?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman from Wisconsin can consume some time now.

Mr. COOPER. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AINEY].

Mr. AINEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have so recently returned from the Far East, traveling extensively in Japan, Korea, Manchuria, and China, traversing the extent of Russia from one extreme of Siberia to the other, crossing on the great Trans-Siberian Railroad, the longest railroad in the world, that in view of the utterances which

have been made upon the floor of this House so recently with regard to the peoples of the Far East I am constrained to make some observations at this time, not in a controversial way, but for the purpose of broadening the perspective of our vision with respect to oriental affairs. These are momentous times. After the cataclysm and seismic convulsions of the warring world shall cease this country of ours is likely to be called upon to take an important part in the rehabilitation and rearrangement of world affairs. We shall need a clear vision, a firm hand, a sympathetic heart, and a temperate tone in order that we may meet that responsibility; and I deprecate any utterance or act which in these sensitive days shall add to the burdens of the President or tighten the tension of our international relations. We should consider the countries of the Far East, their relation to each other and to us, with a calm mind and freed from the prejudices which careless newspaper headlines and unwarranted newspaper utterances are calculated to create, swaying the judgment and stirring the emotions of our people. I feel that at this most critical time in the world's history, when feelings are keyed to highest pitch, when every international relation or activity is incased in tinder ready for the match, that the people and this high legislative body should stand with the President and with the Secretary of State, supporting them in their efforts to keep us off the reefs of war as they are forced to meet the delicate international situations which crowd thick and fast upon them.

I am constrained to believe that every Representative in Congress should carefully avoid any act or utterance calculated to disturb the equipoise of neutrality which we seek to maintain or which is likely to interfere with the solution of the grave problems which face the President and his Cabinet. I am surprised that anyone should carry the firebrand of war in these inflammable days. After this war in Europe, what? It would be a bold man who would now attempt to grasp the future to give an answer. We may assume, however, that the peoples of Europe will be depleted in men and money and that there is likely to be a change of influence, a change of emphasis, when Europe is weakened by war and her progress retarded by at least 50 years.

It may be that the weight of influence shall slip away from Europe, passing beyond the Ural Mountains and find lodgment among the peoples of Asia. Out of this war Russia, with her great resources, is likely to emerge the least harmed of any European power actively engaged in it. Russia territorially is largely Asiatic; ethnologically, she is allied in large measure with the Orient. Russia, slow-moving, ponderous Russia, that has been notching up in all these centuries until she now occupies one-sixth of the land area of the world with 8,417,000 square miles of territory; Russia, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Arctic almost to the Indian Ocean; Russia, with a population of 185,000,000 people; Russia, with a railroad extending 6,000 miles across the Continents of Asia and of Europe; Russia, that can put under arms from twenty-two to thirty millions of men; Russia is a factor in the future development of the world. Russia will pour her commercial activities into the Pacific.

It were interesting to recall that it was Kiaochow, and not Port Arthur, which was Russia's first love. It was almost within her grasp. Under the secret convention known as the Cassini convention, China had leased Kiaochow to Russia; with it went the concession to build the Trans-Siberian Railroad through Manchuria; accompanying it there was an undoubted purpose to build the Kalgan Railroad from Lake Baikal to Peking. A straight line would take this railroad to Kiaochow, thus giving Russia her long-desired open port to the Pacific.

It was about this time that Li Hung Chang made his celebrated trip around the world; he came to Berlin, and Germany became aware of Russia's purpose. The murder of two Lutheran missionaries on the Shantung Peninsula furnished the pretext. Germany seized Kiaochow, and Russia swallowed her chagrin and took Port Arthur as a consolation. This crowded her against Japan. The result is well known. To-day Russia and Japan find themselves in accord, and where Kiaochow may ultimately land is beyond the ken of any who are content to deal with facts. Certain it is there are evidences of renewed activity in railroad construction in the vicinity of Kalgan.

I must not take the time of this committee to speak more particularly of the marvelous transformation and growth of Russia since the Japanese War, of her great commercial activity, of her railroad development. The Trans-Siberian Railroad, double tracked nearly its entire distance, is now equipped with all modern improvements. Russia now is unified, enthusiastic, and prepared.

Nor may I take the time to suggest her purpose of reaching the Indian Ocean, from which she is separated by a few hundred

miles, of immeasurably more advantage to her than is usually considered. A railroad through Persia would be easily constructed.

We speak of Japan in the diminutive. We speak of her as "little Japan," and yet by the way of comparison let me call your attention to the fact that in area and population Japan is larger than the islands of Great Britain and Ireland, larger than France, almost equaling Germany. She has a population of 50,000,000 people, almost that of our own Nation shortly prior to the Civil War. Japan little? Why, when the northern portions of Europe were peopled with barbaric hordes and when Assyria was a world power, shortly after the 10 tribes of Israel were carried away into captivity, Japan put upon herself the habiliments of a mighty nation. Her present monarch can boast an unbroken line of royal ancestry longer than that of any other monarch in all the world. Japan with her splendid universities; Japan that has made marvelous strides in scientific attainment, whose bacteriological research lags behind no nation; Japan spoken of as "little Japan!"

We are confronted by the words "yellow peril." Sometimes I think the American people like generalizations. They are the creators of phrases. Within the term "yellow peril" we have bound up a great deal of misconception. Sometimes I think it has approached almost to the element of hatred, and out of this misconception two things arise—first, a belief that there is irresistibly to come a conflict between the yellow and the white races. That conception, it seems to me, had its ignoble birth in the day when monarchs were entirely supreme and when democracy had little part and power. It was when great monarchs yearned for other countries to conquer and had pre-empted all the earth for the white people, leaving neither hope, part, or place in this great world for any other.

The Japanese and Chinese are here. They exist. Japan has already entered into the society of nations. China will soon follow. Napoleon's expression, with which every schoolboy is familiar, "China is a sleeping giant; let her sleep," is no longer true. The world is dealing with an awakened giant. The question therefore comes to us, What shall be our attitude toward these Asiatic peoples? Shall we irritate them or shall we, as is worthy of a great Nation, give them the consideration which our high position permits and demands?

I am forced to say that for some years there has existed—the source of which I am not at liberty to reveal—a continued effort to create and foster ill will and misunderstanding between the United States and Japan. The newspapers of both countries publish many misleading dispatches. It was only recently that in one of the Tokyo papers there was published a dispatch, purporting to emanate from an American source, in which one of our admirals was quoted as stating that America was about to send a fleet across the seas to make an attack on Japan. What bosh, you say, and yet you are reading in some of your own papers statements of Japan's purposes equally unwarranted and unreliable. When the distinguished minority leader on this side of the House not very many weeks ago made some general utterances not at all antagonistic to the Asiatic people they were telegraphed to Japan, not in the language of his speech, but in language calculated to arouse resentment. There are marvelous misstatements sought to be placed before both peoples. And I rebel against them, because I have had the opportunity of visiting Japan and I believe I know their attitude as I know our own.

Will you let me tell you just one personal incident? It is illustrative of the Japanese. It does not belong in the realm of debate, but it is characteristic. I was invited to address the members of the Imperial Parliament of Japan a few months ago. On my visit to the Parliament House I was ushered into the hall of their representatives and seated in the gallery facing the speaker. The assembly was in a hall nearly as large as this. I listened to the tumult of their debate over the hotly contested naval budget. In the midst of the debate an old gentleman arose and took the rostrum and was escorted to the chair in order that he might speak. He was exceedingly lame, an old man 76 years of age, and as he came before that turbulent audience he raised his hand and stilled it. Then a smile came over the old man's face and he spoke a few words and it brought a ripple of laughter over here and a few more words and there was laughter all over the hall. Then I saw that he had captured his audience of legislators. The smile faded away and in the place of the smile the tense lines came, and, with the most impassioned utterance that it seemed to me I have ever listened to—although I could not understand the words; I felt them—he urged, from what I afterwards learned to be the fact, the development of his country along the lines that seemed to be necessary to him. And he swayed that audience. That

was my introduction to the grand old man of Japan, Count Okuma, a quotation from whom was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday by a gentleman of this House, and I shall refer to it in a moment.

I thought of him and his history. I thought of him as a little Samurai boy, with two swords, one carried on one side and one on the other, one to preserve his country's honor in case it was attacked and the other to take his own life, according to the Japanese standard in case his own honor was invaded. Such a boy was he when Perry knocked at the door of Japan, and I thought of him as the progressive man of Japan who had toiled for the intellectual and commercial development of his country until it has become a marvelous people and a marvelous nation, imbuing it with the idealism of a great purpose. Then I thought of a few years ago how a would-be assassin had thrown a bomb at him and despoiled him of a limb and nearly caused Japan the loss of his splendid services. I thought of his wonderful sense of humor and the grim pathos of his life, and, do you know, my mind insisted upon jumping across the Pacific to my own home land, and I thought of one who likewise had that saving grace of humor, a man who sought his country's welfare, a man loved by the people of this country, and whose name will ever be revered as long as American life shall continue to exist, a man whom the assassin's bullet despoiled us of, and I could not help turning to the Japanese gentleman next to me and saying, "Do you know that your Count Okuma at the present time reminds me in some respects of our own Abraham Lincoln?" And the next day the Japanese newspapers from one end of the land to the other carried that utterance. Why? Because they were pleased that the name of one of their great statesmen should be coupled in compliment with the name of one whom they revere above almost every other man in American history. [Applause.]

I would like to put in the RECORD now the utterance of Count Okuma, made just a few years ago and at a time when there was considerable agitation in our country and in Japan concerning the California situation. I shall not speak at all in a controversial way concerning that situation—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. AINEY. Can the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] indulge me with a little more time?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman five minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. AINEY. I thank the gentleman. Count Okuma gathered together some of the great legislators, some of the great statesmen, some of the people in Japan interested in the world's affairs, and what was his utterance and advice to them? That of belligerency? That of war. That of a desire to invade this country in any way or involve us in any difficulty? Not at all. This was Count Okuma's utterance:

We can not solve this question by diplomacy. We can not solve it by arbitration. We can not solve it by war. We can not solve it by talk of war; that is the worst of all. We must appeal to the great Christian Nation to put in practice the principles for which it stands—the brotherhood of man; and out of this, in the process of time, if we will but content ourselves, the American people will, I am sure, find a solution.

[Applause.]

That was Count Okuma's utterance. But there are many people who seek to get away from such pacific statements made by responsible men of Japan and accept the irresponsible ones of jingoes who exist on either side of the Pacific. They say, "Oh, Japan wants to send her surplus population over here."

Will you permit me to call your attention to the fact that there is the great island of Formosa, the settlement and solution of which can only be made by Japan sending her surplus population to promote them. She is now in Korea, and if you had traveled in Korea as I have recently you would see how much depends on Japan sending her surplus population there. And then if you would go to Manchuria and the neighboring provinces you would see the demand there for Japan's surplus population, and if you go to the northern islands you will see the opportunity there for Japan's surplus population; Japan has a program.

But let me say before I close that Japan's future program is not so much with respect to America as it is with respect to the great country of China, with her 400,000,000 of people, differing materially in thought and purpose from Japan. I shall not seek to differentiate or take sides, except to call your attention to this, that outside of America I believe there is no more patriotic people in the world than the people of Japan, and in China they have not emphasized that national unity of thought and purpose. If you traveled in China now you would find along the zones of the railroads, which represent foreign con-

cessions, a line of English soldiers, a line of German soldiers, a line of Belgian soldiers, a line of French soldiers, and a line of Russian soldiers, each of them having control of portions of China. If we were confronted in Mexico with a population of 400,000,000 of people, would America think that we had a problem down there? And yet Japan, with the great nation of China just across the narrow sea, is confronted with that problem, and she has got to meet and solve that problem. If we will place ourselves in Japan's position and seek to analyze her point of view for a moment, we will get away from an insularity which hampers our vision. Personally I believe that our entanglements with the Far East are not likely to do us any good. I am not inclined to involve ourselves too far with them, but leave them to solution of the peoples most concerned.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. AINEY. I can not yield. I have only a few moments left. I do not want to get into a controversial colloquy with the gentleman in regard to my attitude or views. I have only a few minutes. I asked for half an hour in the beginning, but I could not get it, so that I shall not be able to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. AINEY. A problem likewise confronts China out of this war in Europe; what think you of the likelihood of these concessions, railroad and otherwise, now existing in China with respect to the zones of influence of European powers being likely to continue there? It is a matter of self-preservation for Japan to see that some line of activity is taken with respect to the future of China, and that nation which has apparently little cohesive power shall be tied together by the influence of that nation most capable of aiding. I am not prepared to say that Japan may not aid more than any European power. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AINEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AINEY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BURNETT having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 17122. An act for the relief of John Burrows.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. VAUGHAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. VAUGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VAUGHAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not know that I shall occupy the entire time given to me, but I wish to answer some of the remarks made a few moments ago by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOTT].

Mr. Chairman, in this war now going on in Europe the welfare of our country demands that we should be absolutely neutral. [Applause.] On that proposition all are agreed. If we love our country, we should do all in our power to preserve neutrality. On this proposition all should agree.

It is not for the American Congress to discuss who is to blame for bringing about this war. If we wish to preserve our neutrality, we should refrain from discussions that are calculated to disturb our neutrality.

But we are told that we are not giving Germany a square deal; that we are not observing neutrality toward Germany because some of our citizens are selling arms and munitions of war to the allies; that our Government should lay an embargo upon the exportation of such to all belligerents since Germany can not buy from us on account of British control of the seas. Now, if an observance of neutrality on our part requires that we lay this embargo we should do so, because we profess to be and we ought to be absolutely neutral.

But let us see whether or not an observance of strict neutrality on the part of the Government of the United States requires that we should lay this embargo. Let us examine international law upon the subject and see whether or not the policy of the administration is right. The newspapers carried the information on yesterday that the President had announced that the laying of such an embargo would be an unneutral act.

I undertake to say that any gentleman who will examine the authorities on the subject will come to the conclusion that the President is right, and that he is sustained by all of our Secretaries of State from Jefferson down to the present time.

In the first place I wish to say that our policy on this subject is based upon sound reason. This is not a military country. Our military system is the militia system; and if our country to-day were to become involved in war with any other country, one of the first things we would have to do would be to buy arms and ammunition abroad. In the War with Spain it was one of the first things we had to do, and we bought munitions of war from Germans, although Germany's sympathies were with Spain, and it was not considered unneutral for Germany to permit Germans to sell arms and munitions of war to the United States Government in that War with Spain. The policy of allowing our people to sell arms and munitions of war to belligerents is supported by the sound reason that a country like ours which does not maintain a large standing Army nor immense stores of arms and munitions of war will find it necessary whenever it becomes involved in war to buy arms and ammunition abroad.

If all the nations of the earth were agreed, and if international law were to the effect that the duty devolved upon every neutral Government to prohibit its citizens from selling munitions of war to belligerents, every Government in the world that does not maintain immense stores of munitions of war would find itself at the mercy of those nations that do maintain standing armies and stores of munitions of war.

It does not necessarily follow that it is because of British control of the seas that Germany does not buy arms and munitions of war from our people. The best information is that she does not need to buy abroad, that she is well supplied with immense stores of munitions of war and the means of making them, and would not find it necessary to purchase in the United States, even if Great Britain did not control the sea. In fact, her friends boast of her preparedness and of the impossibility of the allies overcoming her or successfully defending themselves against her.

When this war broke out in Europe the Governments engaging in it had the right to expect that the United States would be neutral, that we would adhere to the policy established in the beginning by Washington which in his Farewell Address he so earnestly advised us to adhere to. These Governments had the right to expect that if we professed neutrality we would practice neutrality as interpreted by the established policy of our Government in regard thereto. [Applause.]

But I said, and I repeat, that if the observance of strict neutrality requires that we lay this embargo, it ought to be done. The question is, Does neutrality require it? Of course, I mean neutrality as interpreted by the established policy of our Government, for no belligerent could expect us to vary from our established understanding of what neutrality requires.

I read from the letter of Mr. Jefferson, Secretary of State, to the British minister, May 15, 1793, volume 7, page 955, of Moore's International Law:

Our citizens have been always free to make, vend, and export arms. It is the constant occupation and livelihood of some of them. To suppress their callings, the only means, perhaps, of their subsistence, because a war exists in foreign and distant countries in which we have no concern would scarcely be expected. It would be hard in principle and impossible in practice. The law of nations, therefore, respecting the rights of those at peace does not require from them such an internal disarrangement in their occupations. It is satisfied with the external penalty pronounced in the President's proclamation, that of confiscation of such portion of these arms as shall fall into the hands of any of the belligerent powers on their way to the ports of their enemies. To this penalty our citizens are warned that they will be abandoned, and that even private contraventions may work no inequality between the parties at war the benefit of them will be left free and open to all.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAUGHAN. Yes.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. If any other policy should obtain throughout the nations of the world, would it not result logically that every country would find it necessary to be constantly employed in arming and panoplying itself in anticipation of wars yet to be declared in times of peace, knowing that it would be impossible to import arms from other countries after war was declared?

Mr. VAUGHAN. I agree with the gentleman entirely. I think I advanced that idea a moment ago. It would make it necessary that the Military Establishment of the United States should cost annually many hundreds of millions more than the immense sum it now costs to be prepared for defense.

Though Jefferson and Hamilton disagreed on many things, on this question they were agreed. I read from Hamilton's Treasury Circular of August 4, 1793 (1 American State Papers

on Foreign Relations, 140, vol. 7, p. 955, Moore's International Law):

The purchasing within and exporting from the United States, by way of merchandise, articles commonly called contraband, being generally warlike instruments and military stores, is free to all the parties at war and is not to be interfered with.

In 1796 France contended that the observance of neutrality on our part required that we should restrain our citizens from selling and exporting articles contraband of war to her belligerent enemies. We refused to yield to her demand, though she was our friend and ally in our struggle for independence. Now France wants to buy from us. We refused to restrain our people from selling to her enemies when she was engaged in a struggle for her existence against all Europe. We refused upon the ground that neutrality forbade. Shall we now, when she is engaged in another war, refuse to permit our citizens to sell to her?

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I could go on making quotations from the declarations of Secretaries of State from Jefferson to Bryan, but I content myself with saying that it is not only international law but it is the American policy, declared by every Secretary of State from Jefferson to Bryan, and it is based upon the fact that we are not a military power, and that we depend for our defense upon the militia system, that our citizens shall be permitted to sell to belligerents in time of war, and that belligerents are remitted in their protection in the matter to capture on the high seas. And if belligerents, in this war now going on, in which we are neutral, and should remain neutral, find themselves at a disadvantage, it is their misfortune and not the fault of the United States. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. KEY of Ohio having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 17982. An act to make Nyando, N. Y., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisement; and

H. R. 18172. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Seymour, Ind.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 3897. An act to authorize the Great Northern Railway Co. to revise the location of its right of way, and for other purposes; and

S. 3362. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, through the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries, to make a survey of natural oyster beds, bars, and rocks, and barren bottoms contiguous thereto, in waters along the coast of and within the State of Texas.

The message also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On February 17, 1915:

S. 1060. An act fixing the date of reenlistment of Gustav Hartfelder, first-class fireman, United States Navy;

S. 3525. An act for the relief of Pay Inspector F. T. Arms, United States Navy;

S. 543. An act to correct the military record of John T. Haines;

S. 145. An act for the relief of Charles Richter;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of Byron W. Canfield;

S. 1377. An act for the relief of Alfred S. Lewis;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of George P. Chandler;

S. 2304. An act for the relief of Chris Kuppler;

S. 2882. An act for the relief of Charles M. Clark;

S. 5695. An act for the relief of the Southern Transportation Co.; and

S. 5970. An act for the relief of Isaac Bethurum.

On February 18, 1915:

S. 1304. An act authorizing the Department of State to deliver to Capt. F. H. Uberroth, United States Revenue-Cutter Service, and Gunner Carl Johansson, United States Revenue-Cutter Service, watches tendered to them by the Canadian Government.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin consume some of his time now?

Mr. COOPER. I have used considerably more time than the gentleman from Virginia, but I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, owing to circumstances it was not possible for me to engage in the discussion on the floor of

the House when the ship-purchase bill was under consideration, but I have in my possession some very important facts that, I think, were not brought out in that debate that seem to me to demonstrate conclusively that there is no danger of any permanent lack of American ships to carry American goods in this present crisis.

In the RECORD of Wednesday, February 17, my colleague [Mr. CURRY] has printed a list of 58 vessels heretofore engaged in the coastwise trade that recently have been transferred to the foreign trade to meet the present crisis. The list is probably far from complete, as I myself know of one coastwise steamer not in the list that has been thus transferred—the *Edson Light*, transferred from the the Great Lakes to salt water.

I am also advised by the highest authority that there are now 30 coastwise ships on the Pacific coast tied up to the dock, with no business to do, that can be transferred to the Atlantic, and doubtless will be so transferred, if it is certain that foreign business can be secured for them that will be profitable.

It is also a fact that three of the steamers of the Great Lakes fleet were last fall taken through the Welland Canal, Lake Ontario, and the St. Lawrence River to salt water and are now carrying cargoes of cotton to Germany. I hold in my hand a printed weekly report of the trade conditions between Germany and this country showing this to be a fact. These three steamers are:

The *Robert M. Thompson*, built by the Great Lakes Engineering Works, of Detroit, Mich.

The *Edson Light*, built by the same company at Ashtabula, Ohio.

The *Kenauha*, built by the Jenks Shipbuilding Co., of Port Huron, Mich.

By this weekly report it appears that the *Robert M. Thompson* sailed from Rotterdam on her return to the United States on January 20, the *Kenauha* on January 30 from Rotterdam, while the date of sailing of the *Edson Light* from Goteborg via Rotterdam was indefinite. It is certain that these three ships are either on the way to Europe or already landed there with another cargo.

There are thousands of steamers on the Great Lakes flying the American flag. Many of these remained all last summer tied to the docks at lower lake ports because there was nothing for them to do. The indications now are that the coming season will be no better than the last for business on the Lakes. Under these circumstances it is perfectly certain that many of these steamers, as soon as the ice is out of the Welland Canal and the St. Lawrence River, will be taken to the Atlantic and put into the trade, provided there is prospect of business for them for any considerable period of time at profitable rates. While some of the lake steamers are too large to go through the Welland Canal, there are hundreds of them that can.

There are nearly 15,000 ships of all kinds flying the American flag engaged in the coastwise trade. Even a small percentage of this number diverted to the ocean carrying traffic would provide for every possible want in the way of ocean freight facilities for our commerce.

These facts must be known by at least some of the active proponents of this ship-purchase bill as well as they are known to me. If so, it is plain that there must be some ulterior or hidden purpose behind this remarkable, revolutionary, socialistic proposition to put the Government into the foreign shipping business other than that which is publicly stated to be the reason for its enactment. There is nothing more certain than that there are plenty of ships under the American flag that may be used to carry any amount of foreign commerce that can possibly be secured by our people without giving our support to this proposition—one of many urged upon this Congress—to put the Federal Government into business hitherto reserved to private enterprise.

In order that I may put these facts before the House, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, it was a great day in Lincoln, Nebr. The city's favorite son had torn himself from his confining duties as Secretary of State and was to deliver before the Lincoln Commercial Club one of his soulful addresses. It

must not for a moment be supposed that the surprise and pleasure of the town were due to the rarity of his public addresses. Far from it. But it was rumored that this address was to be delivered free of charge. Hence the rejoicing in Lincoln. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The fateful day of which I speak was January 6, 1914, and the equally fateful address is fortunately preserved to posterity in the March number of the *Commoner*. Much of Mr. Bryan's speech on that occasion may be passed over without comment; it is sufficient to say that, like most of the keynote speeches delivered by men prominent in the present administration, it deals in predictions and promises; the future tense is overworked to a lamentable degree.

For example, passages such as this are common:

Our Nation has awakened and walks face foremost toward the light. Sometimes the student, looking back through history, bewails the lateness of his birth and says that if he had only been born in some golden age of the past he would have been happy. There is no golden age like this; in all the years there has been no time like ours, no period in all the annals of man when one human being could render such service to the world as he can render to-day. It is the era of hope, the day of confidence, the time of rejoicing.

[Applause.]

So sang sweetly the Secretary of State. It may be that the hundreds of thousands of men and women out of employment, facing daily want and even starvation, forced to stand in the bread line, did not find the year 1914 quite so pregnant with hope, with confidence, with rejoicing, as did the Secretary of State. But that is at the moment neither here nor there.

Even in the mind of the Secretary of State such sentiments as I have quoted were but by-products of his address. The real meat of the discourse is elsewhere. Again I quote from the speech as reported, apparently verbatim, in the March *Commoner*, page 13:

You will find it in the *Commoner*. For authentic news of the progress of the new era, subscribe at once.

[Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I expected incredulity when I stated my opinion that the Secretary of State spoke before the Lincoln Commercial Club without receiving therefor compensation—or, as he doubtless prefers to designate it, "an honorarium." But the mystery is only on the surface; the speech merely provides a suitable stage setting for a deliberate and carefully planned attempt to boom the circulation of the *Commoner*, of which that same Secretary of State is "editor and proprietor." Shades of Thomas Jefferson, of John Quincy Adams, of Daniel Webster, of Richard Olney, and of John Hay!

This is the man who is the head of our great Department of State; this is the man charged with a thousand intricate and delicate details of adjusting our relations with every other power on the globe; this is the man upon whose judgment and foresight may perhaps hang the question of whether the United States will know peace or war the coming year. I do not charge, of course, that any moral opprobrium attached to the utterance which I have just quoted; I have the highest respect for the private character of the Secretary of State. But I do declare that a man so utterly devoid of even the slightest appreciation of the fitness of things is not and can not be anything but a hopeless misfit as the premier of the United States.

Mr. Bryan talks well—and frequently. He is very free with unctuous deliverances on the subject of our foreign policy; his heart yearns for the whole world, and especially, it would seem, does it yearn toward Latin America. For example, in a signed interview which appeared last March in *América E Industrias Americanas*—the price per word is not stated—Mr. Bryan spoke as follows:

It may take some time to convince all of the people of Latin America of this Nation's disinterested friendship. They have sometimes been made the victims of commercial greed; they have sometimes suffered from exploitation by concessionaires without conscience, and are therefore naturally suspicious, but these suspicions can be overcome and will be overcome. * * * They will find in this Nation an increasing regard for their welfare.

Nothing could be more delightful, more uplifting, more soul satisfying, than the sentiment so beautifully expressed. But have theory and practice agreed? I doubt if a single Member of this House would say yes.

The fund of material and information bearing upon this interesting point is abundant to an unhappy degree. A year ago, in a somewhat extended speech, I attempted to show the nature of the substitutions in our ministers to Latin America which had been wrought by Mr. Bryan. I think no one, Republican or Democrat, would regard with pleasure or equanimity the wholesale decapitation in practically every Latin-American post of trained nonpartisan diplomats in favor of crude and wholly untrained Bryanized relics of the free-silver campaign of 1896.

I can take up to-day only one very minute phase of a very great question. I desire to refer at this time to the island of Santo Domingo, or Haiti, one of the Latin-American sisters to whom the Secretary of State so movingly extended the right hand of fellowship.

Santo Domingo is one of those regions of the world which seems likely to have greatness thrust upon it. Surprising as it may seem, few regions of the earth are so little known to-day as this lovely island, lying between Cuba and Porto Rico, in spite of the fact that it is beyond question the finest of the Antilles, and that neither Cuba, Porto Rico, nor Jamaica can compare with it in mineral wealth or in fertility of soil.

But by one of those curious shifts in the current of trade, such as that which brings an obscure way station onto the trunk line of a railroad, the opening of the Panama Canal places the island in the midstream of world traffic. The two main channels by which the shipping of Europe and of America may enter the Caribbean Sea and thence the Pacific Ocean pass on either side of it. On the west is the Windward Passage, between the Haitian end of the island itself and Cuba; on the east is the Mona Passage, between the Santo Domingo end of the island and Porto Rico. On the Windward Passage end of Cuba we have Guantanamo Bay, and at the other extreme we have, of course, the whole island of Porto Rico. We have no military or naval foothold on the island itself. On the western end of the Haitian portion of the island, opposite Guantanamo Bay, is the harbor of Mole St. Nicholas, which is notoriously coveted by Germany; and on the eastern end of the Dominican portion, opposite Porto Rico, is the Bay of Samana, which would have been ours 45 years ago if the Senate, by a tie vote, had not rejected the treaty of cession negotiated by President Grant. As recently stated in the *Independent*, from which the foregoing facts are largely taken:

The island thus occupies a position of unique importance in both naval and commercial strategy. It is already apparent that whether the Panama Canal will attract enough traffic to repay us for the \$400,000,000 we have sunk in it depends more on fuel facilities—that is, on the coal and oil stations of the route—than on the rate of tolls.

Perhaps a few words relative to the history of the island will not be out of place as an introduction to the discussion of the present situation. The island of Santo Domingo, usually known in the old geographies as Haiti or Hayti, is the second largest of the Great Antilles. The eastern two-thirds of the island, with which I am primarily concerned just now, is given over to the little State known indifferently as the Dominican Republic or as the Republic of Santo Domingo. The Dominican Republic covers about 18,000 square miles of territory, an area substantially equal to the combined areas of New Hampshire and Vermont. The Republic of Haiti, as we have seen, occupies the western third of the island and is the oldest colored Republic. The country is almost exclusively agricultural and has an exceedingly fertile soil. The principal product is coffee, which is still cultivated in an exceedingly primitive way. Some sugar is also grown to meet the domestic demand. In neither Republic, on account of the frequent revolutions and the unprogressive character of the people, is the agricultural capacity of the country at all developed. Although the island is about 400 miles long and as much as 165 miles in width, the total mileage in railroads is only 315.

The modern history of the Dominican Republic may be said to begin with the accession to the presidency of the negro Heureaux in 1882. For 17 years this savage despot—whose administration may, in a limited way, perhaps, be compared with that of President Diaz in Mexico—ruled the Dominican Republic with an iron hand, keeping the peace by mingling bribery and terrorism. Those whom he considered useful he kept quiet by graft and plunder; those whom he considered troublesome he killed—about 2,000 out of a total population of some 300,000. In the words of Prof. Jacob H. Hollander, of Johns Hopkins, the reorganizer of Dominican finance under the recent régime:

The country was at peace; but it was the hush of a merciless terrorism, not the quiet of civil government. The seeming well-being which prevailed was attained by a bartering of resources of the country in prodigal concessions, and by discounting the future in reckless debt accumulations.

In the year 1899 Heureaux was assassinated, and, as Dr. Hollander well says, "With Heureaux's assassination came the deluge; the next six years constituted a climax, even in the history of Latin-American politics." There succeeded a reign of terror in the Republic which is comparable only to that which has prevailed in Mexico since the abdication of President Diaz. Chieftain after chieftain attempted to secure and to hold the presidency, and the country groaned under the hopeless and lawless conditions which resulted.

In the words of T. Lothrop Stoddard, writing in the *American Review of Reviews* last June, from whom I have gleaned some of the foregoing facts:

Debasement as it had been to the Dominicans themselves, the 17 years' tyranny of Heuereux had given the outer world a vital interest in the country's future. Attracted by the political quiet imposed by Heuereux's rule, vast amounts of foreign capital had begun the development of the Republic's marvelous resources, while the dictator's lavish foreign loans had imposed heavy interest responsibilities. Accordingly, the carnival of riot and destruction following Heuereux's death had not long continued before the great powers were besieged with appeals from fugitive foreign planters, ruined concessionaires, and defrauded bondholders. And by the year 1904 it became perfectly clear that whatever the United States might fail to do to protect its injured citizens, the European powers were determined to see that their subjects obtained redress. The American Government was plainly told that at least two great European powers were determined on intervention in Santo Domingo if something were not speedily done.

Neither the temper of the United States nor of President Roosevelt would perhaps willingly have brooked intervention by any foreign power. Accordingly in January, 1905, the protocol of an agreement was drawn up between the United States and the Dominican Governments providing that the United States should adjust the Dominican debt and administer the customs for the benefit of creditors. This protocol failing of ratification by the Senate, President Roosevelt made an interim agreement with the then President of Santo Domingo, Morales, providing for the collection of the Dominican customs by persons designated by him, 55 per cent of the proceeds to be deposited in the United States for the benefit of creditors. The various factions in the island were given plainly to understand that they would not be permitted to loot the customhouses in their former manner. This announcement cut the backbone out of the revolution. The nearest customhouse was always the goal of every insurgent "general," and with this possibility removed the lust of conflict quickly cooled.

After two years' operation the success of the Roosevelt-Morales interim agreement became so clear that the Senate consented to ratify a convention for American administration of Dominican customs if the original idea of an American adjustment of the Dominican debt were abandoned. Accordingly, the American receivership of the Republic's customs was formally ratified and assured legal permanence by the American-Dominican convention of 1907, a copy of which I shall append as part of my remarks.

Prior to 1914 but nine years had passed since the Roosevelt-Morales agreement ushered in the new régime; yet those nine years had brought an increase in prosperity and civilization almost unbelievable to those unaware of the marvelous natural wealth of Santo Domingo. Plantations had sprung up on all sides. Railroad extension continually brought new areas under development. Foreign capital poured in freely and the mass of the population enjoyed a prosperity and security never before known. The total customs collections for the fiscal year 1912-13 exceeded \$4,000,000, and the terms of the debt service were met with ease. The total foreign trade had grown from less than \$10,000,000 in 1905 to over \$20,000,000 in 1912, and about the same in 1913. Imports had increased from \$3,000,000 to \$9,000,000 during this period, and exports from \$7,000,000 to \$12,000,000. The share of the United States in the exports of Santo Domingo actually exceeded 70 per cent in one year and averaged close to 60 per cent; of the imports of Santo Domingo the United States was in recent years furnishing well over 60 per cent. The country thus was flourishing, and on the commercial side its friendship was proving financially profitable as well as internationally highly desirable.

I can not take the time to discuss at length the bearing which the foregoing recital has upon a true appreciation of the Monroe doctrine. Prof. Hiram Bingham, in his work upon the Monroe doctrine, says:

Another one of the "fruits" which has not escaped the attention of our neighbors in South America is our intervention in Santo Domingo. . . . There has been an occasional revolution since we took control of the customhouses, but the financial condition of the island is certainly better than it was. Thus we may seem to have been justified in our course, but the fact remains that, although our intervention may have been an excellent thing for the people of Santo Domingo, it has undoubtedly interfered with their right to do as they please with their own money, and has acted as a sinister warning to other Latin-American States as to what they may expect of us if they fail to pay their debts.

It may be admitted that the "international policeman" idea of Prof. Bingham may have disquieting possibilities in the future; at the same time it will be generally recognized that at the end of the Taft administration material conditions in the island had vastly improved. Mr. Stoddard, whom I have already quoted, for example, says:

No page of our foreign policy is brighter than the story of our recent relations with that little State.

Of course, the character of the people had not been wholly changed, and there were during the nine years prior to 1914

ominous warnings that the old spirit of anarchy was still smoldering. In 1911 President Caceres, who had succeeded Morales, was assassinated, and a political upheaval was narrowly averted. In the summer of 1912 open revolution broke out and the insurgents ventured to seize the customhouses in the territory under their control. But President Taft soon showed that he would tolerate no return to the old dispensation, and 750 marines quickly ousted the revolutionists and restored American control.

I have detailed at this length the conditions prior to the advent of the Wilson administration to show the extreme delicacy and importance of the situation presented. Whatever one may think of the application of the Monroe doctrine to the state of facts, we have seen that tremendous prosperity to the people of the island and large increased foreign trade for ourselves had resulted from the step. We were apparently committed to continue in the island, and equally apparently the most careful and adroit management on the part of the United States was necessary to guide into peaceful channels the restless spirits of the people of the Republic.

Realizing the extremely delicate state of affairs, President Taft had in 1911 sent as minister to the Dominican Republic Mr. William W. Russell. Mr. Russell was born in Washington, D. C., in 1859. He was educated at the United States Naval Academy; was civil engineer and served on several surveys in South America, Mexico, and the United States; was lieutenant on the cruiser *America* when that vessel was delivered to the Brazilian authorities; was appointed secretary of the legation at Caracas November 15, 1895—his first purely diplomatic post thus having been the gift of a Democratic President; was appointed secretary of the legation at Panama City February 5, 1904; was appointed minister to Colombia in 1904, and minister to Venezuela in 1905; served as commissioner to the international exposition in Quito, Ecuador, in 1908-9; was appointed minister resident and consul general to the Dominican Republic in 1910, and was made minister, as I have previously stated, in 1911.

In other words, Mr. Russell was a thoroughly trained diplomat who had spent upward of 20 years in various capacities in Latin America. It is doubtful, perhaps, if he had any strong partisan affiliations, but presumably, from the fact that he was originally appointed by President Cleveland, he was a Democrat. He had served some three years in Santo Domingo with marked distinction and was from every point of view abundantly equipped to guide our diplomatic course through a very ticklish channel.

Yet he was displaced just as soon as Secretary Bryan got around to it. And by whom? By a trained diplomat? Hardly, with Mr. Bryan the appointing officer. The selection was James M. Sullivan, a criminal lawyer of New York. The fact that he was the defender of "Bald Jack" Rose seems hardly a sufficient reason for his selection, even from the Bryan point of view; therefore the fact that he was an indefatigable organizer of Democratic clubs in the campaign of 1912 must, beyond peradventure, have been the persuasive circumstance in the appointment. Mr. Sullivan was confirmed by the Senate August 12, 1913, and shortly thereafter went to his post. There were ugly rumors almost at the outset as to the reasons underlying his appointment and as to certain connections of his which were likely to make his presence in the island Republic highly undesirable.

For example, writing in the *North American Review* for February, 1914, that eminent Democrat, Col. George Harvey, refers to the appointment in these terms:

His cousin is a contractor interested in railroad concessions in Santo Domingo.

I have previously pointed out how crushed to earth Santo Domingo had been for years prior to 1905 by domestic and foreign graft, by outrageous concessions, and by profligate and illegitimate contracts. Even if we could not, perhaps, have expected from Mr. Bryan a minister with any affirmative qualifications for the post, it did not seem unreasonable to expect, especially in view of the great delicacy of conditions there prevailing, that he would not appoint a man so manifestly unfit from every point of view to represent the United States Government.

A brief digression is here necessary. The office of general receiver of Dominican customs is a presidential appointment. William E. Pulliam, a Democrat, was receiver general in the early part of the Wilson administration. On June 16, 1913, Walker W. Vick, of Rutherford, N. J., was appointed to succeed Mr. Pulliam. Who's Who for 1914-15 tells us that Mr. Vick was "manager general headquarters Woodrow Wilson, at New York, pre-convention campaign, 1912; assistant secretary of the Democratic National Committee, 1912, and organized New

York Headquarters; secretary Wilson inaugural committee; Democrat; member Democratic Club at Rutherford, N. J., and of Bergen County Democratic Club of Hackensack, N. J." At all events, there seems no doubt of Mr. Vick's democracy or Woodrow Wilsonism; subsequent events have proved that he also had a backbone.

Shortly after Minister Sullivan's arrival at Santo Domingo, the internal conditions in the island became greatly disturbed and continued to become more and more chaotic as the months passed.

In December, 1913, when the Dominican elections occurred, the Wilson administration took the extraordinary step of sending over a horde of Americans to "supervise" the elections. Current Opinion for January, 1914, says:

The dispatch to Santo Domingo last month, in spite of the protest of that Government, of three officials connected with our State Department, and about 300 other Americans employed in the public service of Porto Rico, to observe and report on the elections, was an application of this new policy regarding constitutional governments (i. e., not to deal with or to countenance anything else). It was explained by Secretary Bryan, in a letter to Minister Sullivan, as follows:

"Please say to President Bordas that the President has planned to send a number of Americans to visit the principal polling places on election day, not as a 'commission' for which this Government asks any official recognition, but only as individuals, to lend moral support by their presence to the efforts which President Bordas has so fully pledged himself to make that the elections shall be free and uninfluenced in every respect, and in order that, if any questions should arise as to good faith of anyone concerned, undeniably impartial witnesses may be available to bear testimony as to exactly what happened."

I wonder if the intolerable smugness of this letter deceived even the most ignorant Dominican? We had no protectorate over the island or the Republic; we had no possible concern with its elections. This letter recognizes these circumstances and yet these Americans "visit" the polling places merely as "individuals to lend moral support by their presence" and to furnish "undeniably impartial" testimony in case of need. The phrasing of Mr. Bryan's letter would make it equally proper to send men to "supervise" British, French, or Italian elections. Perhaps the action was wise in this case, in spite of the strongly voiced opposition of the Republic itself; in spite of the clear departure from the Monroe doctrine as usually understood. But let us at least be candid in what we do and not hopelessly hypocritical.

Mr. Sullivan, as we have seen, had a troubled year in Santo Domingo. On June 9, 1914, Mr. Vick, after nearly a year of strife with Minister Sullivan, tendered his resignation, and immediately returned to the United States to bring to the attention of the Wilson administration just what manner of man our representative was.

A Washington dispatch, dated July 7, 1914, stated:

James M. Sullivan, United States Minister to Santo Domingo, is returning to Washington from his post, whence he sailed for New York on July 2. Mr. Sullivan has been in Santo Domingo nearly a year, during which time conditions in that Republic have been in constant turmoil, and at the present time a state of war prevails in the north, requiring the presence of American warships. Mr. Sullivan has been severely criticized because of his conduct of the affairs of his office, and doubt was expressed by many here that he will return to his post after he reaches this country.

It was only a few days ago that Walker Vick resigned the directorship of customs in Santo Domingo. It is understood here that friction between Vick and Sullivan was the real cause of Mr. Vick's resignation.

As illustrating the condition in the island about the same time and as showing conclusively how within a year a comparatively peaceful and orderly community had gone back to the dark age of anarchy and revolution, it may be worth while to append at this point a brief dispatch from Washington, dated July 15, 1914:

TO TAKE HAND IN DOMINICAN AFFAIRS—TRANSPORT "HANCOCK," CARRYING MARINES AND BLUEJACKETS, AND GUNBOAT SENT TO GUANTANAMO.

WASHINGTON, July 14, 1914.

With the transport *Hancock* speeding through the Gulf of Mexico, carrying marines and bluejackets from Vera Cruz toward Guantánamo, Cuba, as the first move in a demonstration to warn Haiti and San Domingo that they must put their Governments in order, it was intimated in official circles to-day that if actual intervention became necessary the United States might establish a financial trusteeship in Haiti and insist upon enlarging the authority it now exercises in the collection of Dominican customs.

Any radical change, it was said, in the administration policy toward the island Governments would be aimed to establish a fair system of internal and external taxation, with guarantees for the proper expenditures of collections. American administrators of the Dominican customs have complained that their present powers are too limited.

Several European powers have made representations to the American State Department concerning large financial interests that have suffered from continuance of revolutionary chaos in the little Republics. Financial affairs of both Governments, it is known, are in a state very unsatisfactory to foreign creditors. San Domingo's customs revenues have been so curtailed that it is said to be doubtful whether they will suffice to meet regular charges on account of the consolidated foreign debt, for which they are pledged. Conditions in Haiti are not much better.

Last fall, in response to the determined campaign by Mr. Vick for an investigation of Minister Sullivan's career, the State Department made a somewhat abortive investigation of Dominican affairs, with especial reference to the participation therein of Mr. Sullivan. This did not satisfy Mr. Vick, and he finally succeeded last December in having former Mayor Phelan, of San Francisco, Democratic Senator elect from California and a man of high distinction and ability, designated to conduct a real inquiry into the career in Santo Domingo of Minister Sullivan. The newspapers have stated that this action was taken by President Wilson "over Secretary Bryan's head." The dispatches, dated December 10 last, stated:

President Wilson has ordered an investigation into charges that James M. Sullivan, of New York, now minister to the Dominican Republic, had been guilty of misconduct in office, mainly through alleged use of influence to obtain contracts from the Dominican Government for a relative and friends and by having Dominican revenue collections transferred to a bank in Santo Domingo city which New York financial interests friendly to Mr. Sullivan were said to control.

The investigation was conducted for some two weeks in New York during January last, then for a few days here in Washington, and it is understood that Mr. Phelan has within a few days sailed for Santo Domingo for a thorough search into the history of Mr. Sullivan's régime there. Mr. Phelan will doubtless ultimately make a full report to the President, though whether or not this report will be made available to the public is not yet known. President Wilson is certainly to be commended for his vigorous, though somewhat tardy, action along this line and for the designation of a man of the parts of Mr. Phelan.

While I have nothing but the highest respect and regard for Senator Phelan, both as a man and as a public servant, it must not be forgotten that he is a staunch Democrat and that in his recent successful campaign for his seat in the Senate he relied mightily upon the written indorsements of President Wilson and Secretary Bryan. I am sure he will intend to be absolutely fair, but after all his predisposition must necessarily be to stand by and to uphold the administration and its appointees. Under these circumstances the investigation can hardly be deemed an impartial one. Indeed, it can hardly be called, in any true sense, an investigation at all.

How fundamentally different is this inquiry from one conducted by a bipartisan congressional select committee. Take, for example, the investigation conducted in 1910 by a Republican Congress of a Republican Cabinet officer. The special committee consisted of 12 Members, 6 from the Senate and 6 from the House. Four from each branch were Republicans and two were Democrats. The minority was allowed to designate its own representatives on that committee.

The investigation of such a committee, whatever the majority might report, was absolutely certain to bring to light every material fact upon which the public might base an intelligent opinion. How different is the present situation. The "commission" of inquiry consists of one member; that member is a staunch Democrat; he has no power to subpoena witnesses and he has the power—even though not the inclination, perhaps—to bring out what testimony he wishes and to suppress what he deems best. His finding obviously can not under the circumstances carry with it the weight which it should.

Much of the testimony, as reported in the newspapers, has dealt with the alleged corrupt negotiations of Mr. Sullivan with the various interests who were seeking to exploit the poor little Republic for their own welfare. A great deal of the testimony is exceedingly unsavory and certainly indicates a condition, of which Mr. Sullivan had knowledge, to be deplored by every right-thinking American. The testimony upon this head, however, is so extensive and so complex that it seems preferable not to attempt to abstract it at this time for fear that, unwittingly, some injustice might be done Mr. Sullivan or his associates. There are certain aspects of the testimony, however, to which reference may properly and perhaps profitably be made at this time.

KNOWLEDGE THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD AS TO WHAT WAS GOING ON.

It should be remembered, as before stated, that both Mr. Vick and Mr. Pulliam, whom I shall quote principally, are Democrats and prima facie friendly to the administration and its policies. Mr. Vick was the personal selection of Secretary of War Garrison for the post at the island. In an interview with Mr. Garrison which appeared in the course of the hearings in New York last month, the *New York World* of Saturday, January 16, 1915, reports him as follows:

I am responsible for the appointment of collector of customs. I appointed Mr. Vick, and I accept the responsibility for his appointment. I know nothing about the other appointments, and I will not discuss the case any further.

Mr. Vick repeatedly tendered his resignation after the administration at Washington refused to act on the information sent by him to the War Department regarding certain doubtful episodes in Santo Domingo. Finally, as Mr. Vick refused to be longer responsible for conditions there, his resignation was accepted by President Wilson in terms flattering to Mr. Vick's integrity and ability. This is what the returned official had to say of the unsavory conditions in the island:

Before resigning my office I exhausted every resource at my command, both as an official and as an individual, first to induce, later to compel, a competent and impartial investigation of the appointment of Minister Sullivan and his official acts. I felt then and I believe now that the honor of the American Government and of the Democratic administration is involved. I was advised repeatedly to keep my own skirts clean and to ignore the conditions surrounding me—a situation that I could not close my eyes to and maintain my self-respect. Such an attitude is not my ideal of citizenship nor of public service. I know, too, that it is not the ideal of President Wilson, and I have never faltered in my faith that if ever the truth about Santo Domingo could be placed directly in his hands there would be prompt and righteous action.

It should be remembered that Mr. Vick resigned his office about the first of June last and that Mr. Sullivan is still minister to Santo Domingo.

As stated in the Boston Advertiser of December 9 last:

The air of sanctity which hangs around the office of the Secretary of State at Washington has been disturbed by certain meddlesome persons who will not be hushed up and who seem to grow more insistent the longer Mr. Bryan tries to ignore them.

The charge has been made to Secretary Bryan repeatedly (and with the offer of proofs to be examined by him whenever he is willing to make the investigation) that interests which have never appeared publicly in the matter have been at work to use the influence of the United States to get for themselves a number of concessions in Santo Domingo. We do not know how much of truth there may be in these charges. There have been some pretty strong accusations made, and the investigation made by Congress this winter may serve to show how much of all this case can be proven by incontestable evidence. But at least the charges are made by Democrats against Democrats, so that it can hardly be claimed that the affair has any partisan tinge.

The whole history of affairs in Santo Domingo since the present American minister, James M. Sullivan, took charge there, presents evidence of more or less influence by Tammany men upon the business affairs of the Republic. Just how far the events were subject to the influence of Minister Sullivan will be one of the things which Congress must be expected to determine. Mr. Sullivan, as the former attorney for the notorious "Jack" Rose, in the Rosenthal affair, was probably pretty well acquainted with the type of Americans who followed him to Santo Domingo City, and who showed such activity in attempting to influence the course of financial decisions, after American influence became predominant there.

A few weeks ago word came from Washington that the State Department had asked some prominent Americans to conduct a rigid inquiry into the conduct of Minister Sullivan and his general policies in Santo Domingo, and that the verdict of these men had fully exonerated the American minister. This was accepted by the American public as satisfactory, and we had supposed that the whole case had been dropped. The surprising feature now develops that the men who were publicly named as investigators emphatically deny that they served in any such capacity. They declare that Secretary Bryan must have been misled by somebody, and they insist that they are as ignorant of the alleged "investigation" as anybody else could be. They declare that they made no report on the case for the very good reason that they were never asked to do so, and never took any part in the reported "inquiry."

It is to be noted that since the attempt of Secretary Bryan to use the whitewash pail and brush in this case, rumors have been flying thick and fast at Washington, to the effect that Mr. Bryan is soon to leave the Cabinet. Whether the two developments have been wholly independent, or whether there may be some connection between them, we do not profess to know. But it is at least certain that Mr. Vick's emphatic statements have caused a decided flutter at Washington. The fact that Mr. Vick stands so close to W. F. McCombs, President Wilson's most influential adviser, lends further weight to the gravity of the proposed investigation. Altogether, the general impression that the Santo Domingo charges may carry a large amount of concealed political dynamite may be easily understood under such circumstances.

Former Receiver Pulliam testified that after his removal he had warned Assistant Secretary of State Osborne and Gen. McIntyre, head of the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the War Department. "That is what incenses me so much," said Mr. Pulliam; "to know that the administration would lend its exclusive ears to one particular faction only in Santo Domingo politics." Pulliam further testified that he had specifically warned Mr. Osborne in July, 1913: "Under no circumstances have anything to do with the Banco Nacional crowd," and had explained the character of the institution to him and that it was seeking to exploit Dominican finances.

I was surprised and incensed [said Mr. Pulliam] that such a coterie got to Bryan's ears. I was sorry to see the receivership of customs made the subject of political exploitation. I recalled the instructions which Secretary Root gave me when he said that those funds should be administered as a sacred trust. For eight years the receivership had been operated without any trouble and the difficulties that later arose were unquestionably caused by Sullivan's transferring the funds to the Banco Nacional. That was what they wanted. They had no funds. They wanted to establish credit for themselves. Why, nobody would accept their notes of issue except as handbills on the street. The bank was a joke.

James L. Bryne, of Boston, a construction engineer, testified to a conversation which he had had with the Secretary of State; that he had told Mr. Bryan that the minister's cousin, Timothy J. Sullivan, had stated to him that the minister had

arranged that the Banco Nacional should get Government contracts, and that he—Timothy J. Sullivan—was down in Santo Domingo to manage the construction work and to see that Minister Sullivan got his "bit." Continuing, he said:

The American people, the President of the United States, and the Democratic Party have been discredited and dishonored in Santo Domingo by the conduct of Minister Sullivan. I did everything I could to get Mr. Bryan to take the matter up.

MR. SULLIVAN'S DIPLOMATIC METHODS.

Mr. Vick in the course of the examination was asked if he knew of an official call paid by the Italian minister and by the British chargé d'affaires upon Mr. Sullivan. He replied:

I know from a gentleman who was present and whose name I can not reveal publicly that these officials called upon Mr. Sullivan and that when he received them he wore only trousers and an undershirt open at the throat, with his suspenders dangling behind him. I am told he greeted the diplomats as "old sports," and that they were so indignant that they left and refused to call upon him again.

Mr. Vick further testified that the affair became the subject of much unfavorable comment in official and business circles.

Charles A. Butlin, former director general of telegraph and wireless service in Santo Domingo, testified that Mr. Sullivan—

Would not even take off his hat when the members of the Dominican cabinet called upon him, and it was common report that on one occasion he received the Italian Minister, Massignia, and another diplomat, in his undershirt, with his suspenders hanging down.

It is stated elsewhere in the testimony that the diplomatic call above referred to was made during the hours customary for such diplomatic formalities, and Sullivan could not justly plead that he was taken unawares. The story was told to Mr. Vick by an eyewitness.

Mr. Butlin also told of Sullivan generally affronting the sensibilities of the Dominicans, who are an extremely ceremonious and ceremonial people, by his boorish manners.

An interesting side light to indicate the point of view of an American citizen upon Mr. Sullivan's methods was furnished by Commissioner Phelan.

"When I was mayor of San Francisco," said Mr. Phelan, "I paid an official call upon the Lord Mayor of London. It seems there was moving or house cleaning going on, and his lordship came downstairs and greeted me in his shirt sleeves. I had supposed that the lord mayoralty consisted mostly of clothes. Later the lord mayor invited me to a dinner, which I declined to attend because I considered his reception of me as an official caller in his shirt sleeves was an insult."

HOW WAS MR. SULLIVAN REGARDED IN SANTO DOMINGO?

Perhaps this question answers itself. Mr. Vick was asked by Commissioner Phelan:

Q. Is Mr. Sullivan popular in Santo Domingo?

A. Hardly; I should say not.

Q. Was he ever fired at?

A. With bricks, not bullets. He has been hissed and hooted when driving, and on one occasion the lamps of his carriage were smashed by a mob. There is ample testimony that he frequently went driving with a guard of Government troops.

John L. Mann, former American director of public works in Santo Domingo, testified that he had informed the State Department that Mr. Sullivan had greatly offended the Dominicans and that he made it impossible for any American to walk the streets without being subject to insults. Mr. Mann also testified that Sullivan's personal habits were offensive to any Spanish-American who regards observance of the forms of etiquette as important.

Mr. Semple testified that last year he went to Mr. Bryan and begged him not to return Sullivan to his post. He read to Secretary Bryan a telegram from Paul Fuller—whom President Wilson sent to Mexico as his trusted agent—to the same effect. Testifying further, he said:

It is the consensus in Santo Domingo among Americans, Dominicans, Germans, and other foreign merchants that Minister Sullivan is a detriment to American business; that his connection with the Bordas government—whatever it may have been—and his relations with the Banco Nacional and his open association with its president make it impossible for him to serve American interests.

Mr. Vick on another occasion testified that Sullivan was generally credited with being responsible for the Dominican revolution of 1914 because he upheld the Bordas government against the Legalistas.

I do not wish it to be thought that I regard it as a serious indictment of Mr. Sullivan that he was careless in his dress, manners, or speech; we all know many men of the highest character and standing in the community who are not over-scrupulous in these ways. But, as one of the witnesses testified, the Dominicans are a "polite" people; like most Latin-Americans they think a great deal of the forms of life and are often-times greatly influenced in their estimate of a man by his personal methods of speech and dress. If Mr. Sullivan had been in the island as an individual, it would not have been of great consequence how he comported himself. But he was in the island

as the official representative of the people of the United States. It was incumbent upon him, if he could honorably do so, to demean himself so as to merit and obtain the approval of the people among whom he was to live. Conduct of this kind was what they had been, doubtless, accustomed to from experience with Minister Russell and his predecessors and it was what they felt they had a right to expect of Mr. Sullivan. They were bitterly disappointed in him and showed their resentment in reprehensible but characteristic ways. Mr. Sullivan's usefulness as a diplomat was gone from the moment when the people began to hate him. He could no longer serve his country efficiently. We all know the importance of the personal side of our diplomatic service; we all know that Mr. Herrick and Mr. Gerard and Mr. Page have been of supremest usefulness in the anxious six months just passed because they were respected, admired, and beloved by the people to whom they were accredited. We all know perfectly well, too, that after hostility succeeds friendship, usefulness disappears. And usefulness in this connection means not merely an establishment and maintenance of friendship, but an increase in volume of trade which can be measured in dollars and cents. Mr. Sullivan was tried in the balance and found wanting in this exceedingly material way, and it is no necessary imputation upon his character or intentions that such is the case.

Nor do I mean to be captious in criticizing the State Department for the way the Sullivan ministry turned out. The best of men go wrong sometimes and the State Department can not be an insurer of the tact and skillfulness of a given representative in a difficult mission. My criticism of the State Department is, first, in sending to this delicate post a man whose training and experience had been such as manifestly to make it impossible, or at all events exceedingly unlikely, that he would wisely or successfully fit into the general scheme of things in the island; and second, in closing its ears to the repeated and sinister reports which we have seen were continually being brought to the attention of Mr. Bryan and his subordinates. I do not then blame the department because Mr. Sullivan turned out badly, because his régime in Santo Domingo has set back the United States there more than can well be measured; I blame it because at the outset it was manifest to any fair-minded man that Mr. Sullivan was not a judicious choice, and because, as the months passed, in spite of repeated warnings from authentic and dependable sources of information, no attempt was made to bring to an end his wretched official career.

Now we come naturally to the famous letter written by Secretary of State Bryan to Mr. Vick at Santo Domingo, dated August 20, 1913. Our memories are still charged with the events of that month of August, 1913. The Mexican situation was highly critical at that moment and the President was even then preparing his message to Congress, which he read on the 27th of August. The exigency was indeed such as to strain the resources of the State Department and of the Secretary of State. Yet just at this time, when one would have supposed him to be immersed in the grave questions arising out of the Mexican trouble, we find Mr. Bryan writing the following letter to Mr. Vick:

WALKER W. VICK,
Receiver of Customs, Santo Domingo City.

MY DEAR MR. VICK: Now that you have arrived and are acquainting yourself with the situation, can you let me know what positions you have to reward deserving Democrats? Whenever you desire suggestions from me in regard to a man for any place down there, call on me.

You have had enough experience in politics to know how valuable workers are when the campaign is on and how difficult it is to find suitable rewards for the deserving. I do not know to what extent a knowledge of the Spanish language is necessary for employees. Let me know what is requisite, together with the salary and when appointments are likely to be made.

Sullivan will be down before long, and you and he together ought to be able to bring about such reforms as may be necessary there, and you will find Sullivan a strong, courageous, and reliable fellow. The more I have seen of him the better satisfied I am that he will fit into the place there and do what is necessary to be done.

Very truly, yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 20, 1913.

Note the language—

Positions to reward deserving Democrats; find suitable rewards for all the deserving.

Not a thought or a suggestion of experience or ability or character or Americanism—just a brazen attempt to find any kind of a job for the Bryan hangers-on. Interpreted in the light of Mr. Bryan's point of view, it is easy to understand the meaning of his suggestion in the letter that he is satisfied that Minister Sullivan will "do what is necessary to be done." This phrasing makes still clearer—if, indeed, any evidence were needed—the motives behind Mr. Bryan's selection of Sullivan and the entire absence of any belief on his part that capacity and character were necessary elements in a minister to a foreign nation. It

must be remembered that Mr. Bryan, in penning this letter, was writing to a staunch Democratic campaigner, to a man who he believed shared his own more or less high ideals of what constitutes true public service.

Contrast this letter, with its revealing frankness, with the high-sounding and sonorous interview which, as we have seen, Mr. Bryan caused to be circulated through Latin America:

It may take some time to convince all of the people of Latin America of this Nation's disinterested friendship.

Indeed it may.

They have sometimes been made the victims of commercial greed; they sometimes have suffered by exploitation by concessionaires without compensation, and are therefore naturally suspicious, but these suspicions can be overcome and will be overcome.

Can Mr. Bryan think in his heart, or even have the effrontery to say, that he, in the Santo Domingo incident, was practicing what he preaches? Can any instance be found in our recent history of more complete and thorough hypocrisy? Let us call the whole story "Pecksniff Up to Date."

Let us see what these jobs were which Mr. Bryan sought for "deserving Democrats." Here is the list as furnished him by Mr. Vick:

	Yearly salary.
Deputy receiver general of customs.....	\$6,000
Secretary to the receivership; minimum, \$1,800; maximum.....	2,400
Chief statistician.....	2,200
Assistant auditor; minimum, \$1,800; maximum.....	2,200
Record clerk; minimum, \$1,600; maximum.....	1,920
Superintendent of Revenue-Cutter Service.....	2,200
Executive clerk.....	1,500
Spanish stenographer and translator.....	1,800
Five special inspectors; total salaries, minimum, \$9,000; maximum.....	12,000
Customs collector.....	2,200
Total.....	34,420

Mr. Vick testified that Secretary Bryan, on the recommendation of Boaz Long, until lately chief of the Division of Latin-American Affairs in the Department of State, had appointed Charles M. Johnston, of Indianapolis, financial expert for the Republic.

Bryan told me that Johnston would get \$8,000 a year and expenses—

Said Mr. Vick.

Johnston was a flour salesman in Mexico, and as far as I know has never had any experience that will qualify him for the job. He's been down there six months and hasn't done a thing yet. Johnston is supposed to be a sort of a comptroller, a new office picked out of the skies.

When Secretary Bryan was told that a copy of his Vick letter was made public he made this statement:

I am glad to have the public know that I appreciate the services of those who work in politics and feel an interest in seeing them rewarded. I think these are the only charges that can be based on that letter, and as Mr. Vick received his appointment as a reward for political work, I thought he was a good man to address in expressing my opinion on the subject.

The New York World reporter states that when the above statement was read to Mr. Bryan for verification, he appeared to be greatly pleased with it.

He gave the impression that he believed some of his jobless followers of former years might understand that he was still looking for places where he could put them on a regular pay roll.

Another account states:

The Secretary of State seemed to regard the entire matter as a huge joke. The suggestion that the State Department had been made, since his entrance into office, a sort of employment bureau for the faithful machine politicians from various quarters of the United States, did not interest the Secretary in the least. He listened to the further suggestion that the offices parceled out in Santo Domingo were in no sense political plums, in view of the fact that the salaries were paid, not out of the United States Treasury, but from the Dominican treasury, without comment.

It is apparent that a sense of the fitness of things can not be injected into the Secretary of State by any methods now known to civilization.

Contrast this attitude with that of the previous history of the receivership. Mr. Pulliam, who had held the office of receiver of customs for six years prior to the incumbency of Mr. Vick, testified that he never had a demand or even a suggestion offered by the Department of State during the Republican régime that he should find places for "deserving Republicans." He said that politics had never entered into the receiver's office until the advent of the Bryan-Sullivan régime. "I always remembered the instructions given me by ELIHU ROOT, Secretary of State, when I was appointed, that the funds of the receivership were a sacred Government trust and should be guarded and administered with a knowledge of that fact." As I have previously stated, it is said in the newspaper accounts of the hearings that Mr. Pulliam is himself a Democrat.

In view of the extremely uneasy temper of the inhabitants of Santo Domingo; in view of the fact that our relationship to that island was that of a fiduciary and a guardian; in view of

the fact that Latin America was watching closely our conduct there; in view of the fact that United States partisan politics had always been rigidly excluded from the island; in view of repeated and enlightened utterances upon disinterested friendship for Latin America made by the "Apostle of (gold) Peace," it would seem as if the United States had a right and a duty to ask the writer of the Vick letter to indite another epistle—a letter of resignation as Secretary of State. [Applause.]

It is a comfort to know that the newspapers and magazines of the country have given the incident the treatment which it deserves. At the end of these remarks, I shall append some additional comments, mostly from newspapers inclined to be friendly to the present administration. The Literary Digest for January 30, last, sums up the situation thus:

The impression made upon the independent press may be gathered from the Springfield Republican's declaration that Mr. Bryan's utterances "deeply alarm as well as affront the best citizenship of the land," the New York Evening Post's characterization of his letter as "probably the most disgraceful thing ever written by any American Secretary of State," and the New York Globe's sweeping assertion that "in our whole history there has not been such an exhibition of indecency by a man in high office." Several independent papers hint that Mr. Bryan should now pen another letter containing his resignation. Mr. Bryan is revealed to the country, according to the New York Tribune (Rep.), as "a Secretary of State without sensitiveness and without shame." But the Democratic New York World is hardly less severe. Mr. Bryan, it says, "is a good man, an amiable man, and a well-meaning man, but he has no common sense and no appreciation of the dignity of his office." "Even Charles F. Murphy," declares the World, "would have hesitated to send that kind of a letter to a subordinate Tammany official. He would have regarded it as too raw," and the World is convinced that "by his folly and foolishness, Mr. Bryan has given the Republicans legitimate issue that the country will not hear the last of for many a day." Similarly, the Charleston News and Courier (Dem.) admits that "the letter to Vick will be used for all its worth, and that it will alienate thousands who have been looking to the Democracy as the party of progress."

The National Civil Service Reform League, at its annual mid-winter meeting held in New York on the 7th of this month, after thoroughly discussing the Bryan-Vick letter, adopted the following resolution:

The National Civil Service Reform League profoundly regrets that the Secretary of State appears to have suggested and advocated and later publicly justified the use of the customs service of Santo Domingo, constituting a national trust for the benefit of another American Republic and its creditors, to reward partisan services in our domestic politics.

The National Civil Service Reform League, by its governing body, declares this course plainly inconsistent, not only with fidelity to the principles of the merit system and with the purpose avowed in the Democratic national platform of 1912, to make "merit and ability the standard of appointment and promotion rather than service to a political party," but with ordinary good faith toward the Dominican Republic and its creditors. It hereby publicly expresses its earnest hope that the President will promptly take such effective action as may prevent the practical application of a policy so generally and justly condemned.

Seriously, why does Mr. Bryan continue on as Secretary of State? It must be inconvenient for him to adjust his occasional visits to the State Department so as not to interfere with his speaking engagements elsewhere; and, furthermore, the necessity which he is under in Washington of occasionally speaking without compensation must, in accordance with familiar economic laws, somewhat reduce the numbers of those who will later pay to hear him lecture. A newspaper account, dated November 30, 1914, analyzed the amount of time which the Secretary has been able to devote to the foreign affairs of the Government during the previous six weeks—six weeks that were pregnant with sinister possibilities that the United States might be involved in the European war. Perhaps the article is worth reproducing in full:

BRYAN ON THE JOB 10 DAYS OUT OF 46.

WASHINGTON, November 30, 1914.

Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan devoted just 10 days of his time to the foreign affairs of the Government, over which his department has control, from October 14 to November 28, inclusive.

Mr. Bryan passed Friday in Washington, on his way from his estate in Florida to Ann Arbor, Mich., where he addressed the students of the University of Michigan Saturday evening.

From October 14 to November 10 Bryan was making political speeches in various parts of the country.

From November 10 until November 17 he was at the State Department.

Proceeding to his Florida estate on the latter date, he remained there until November 24.

Returning to Washington on November 24, he put in two days (Thanksgiving being a holiday and therefore not counting) at the State Department. On Friday night he closed his desk and entrained for Ann Arbor. He is scheduled to return on Tuesday next for a short stay.

TIME TO UNEARTH A JOB.

The Secretary of State's last act before leaving Washington for his recent sojourn in Florida was to unearth a \$5,000 job—that as counsel for the Canadian Boundary Commission—and to confer it upon Manton M. Wyvel, his private secretary. The duties of this office, which is catalogued in the "lame duck" class, are purely nominal; the wage is good.

Until Mr. Bryan's departure for Florida a considerable portion of his time each day has been given to the reception of political friends and to tireless efforts to land them in jobs.

On the day before he turned over the affairs of the State Department to Assistants Lansing and Adee an American engaged in business in South America was compelled to wait for more than two hours while Mr. Bryan discussed patronage with political retainers. The business man's description illuminates a scene that has been typical in the State Department since Mr. Bryan became the head of it. It was:

"It was really amusing to me, because I had come from New York on a matter of diplomatic purport. As I sat waiting for the Secretary I procured a view of how business is not done in the State Department. Five men of the Bryan type held the attention of the head of the Foreign Department. I was by force of proximity compelled to hear fragments of the conversation. From what I heard I gleaned that the callers had been 'friends' since '96. Each of the callers was looking for a job.

GLAD TO SEE THEM.

"The Secretary of State was manifestly glad to see them. He blushed like a school girl at the words of praise showered upon him. He beamed appreciatively upon hearing assurances of future indulgence of such political ambitions as he may desire to exploit. All of the callers departed with manifest satisfaction over their prospects for being stacked up against the national pay roll."

As a New York headline facetiously phrased it the other day—just before Thanksgiving, in fact—"Secretary Bryan returns to Washington for the holidays."

The most recent development in the Santo Domingo situation of which I have knowledge is recited in a press dispatch from Santo Domingo, dated January 22, 1915, and reads as follows:

SANTO DOMINGO, January 22.

A sensation has been caused here by the discovery of defalcations in the funds of the department of public works, amounting to many thousand dollars. The public works of the Dominican Republic are expended under supervision of the United States Government in its capacity as trustee for the Dominican Republic.

American officials are said to be involved in the misappropriations, but no detailed information is obtainable.

I am informed from official sources that sufficient evidence has been obtained to begin prosecutions, but that the American minister, James M. Sullivan, has caused further action in the matter to be postponed.

Mr. Sullivan is said to have acted upon instructions from Secretary of State Bryan, but it can not be learned why Washington desired the matter to be kept quiet at this time.

It is, indeed, to be hoped that Senator Phelan, during his stay in Santo Domingo, will succeed in getting to the bottom of this new scandal, as well as of those which have preceded it.

There are many other phases of the recent activity of the State Department which I should like to discuss, supplementary to my speech of April 2, 1914, on the diplomatic service; I should like to pay my tribute to the thoughtful invitation tendered to the navy of Switzerland to participate in the opening of the Panama Canal; I should like to refer to the strange case of Mr. George Fred Williams, minister to Greece, a lawyer who almost made himself king; I should like to deal with the case of Mr. Madison R. Smith, who was the first white man who ever served as minister to the Haitian end of the island of Santo Domingo, who has eulogized the Secretary of State and Assistant Secretary Osborne as "the greatest diplomats of all time," to assist whom the State Department was obliged to rush down a special secretary to untangle the routine work of his office and who was recently permitted to return permanently to the classic shades of Farmington, Mo.; I should like to take up the case of Robert E. Jeffery, of Newport, Ark., recently appointed minister to Uruguay—a job which, it is said, the Secretary of State turned over bag and baggage to the Arkansas Senators to parcel out to some unusually deserving Democrat from their State; I should like to speculate why young Mr. Hornbrook, of Albany, Oreg., unknown even by name to any of the three Oregon Members of Congress, was appointed minister to Siam—unless, indeed, it is the fact that he is connected with a little weekly newspaper, the Albany Democrat; I should like to scrutinize the ethics of the appointment as vice consul of John L. Cutright, of Lincoln, Nebr., who is the son of an erstwhile political enemy of Mr. Bryan, now reconciled by this appointment, and who wrote so indiscreetly pro-German statements that it was necessary summarily to recall him from his English post. All these are fruitful fields of inquiry, but time is now lacking for any adequate treatment. I may take occasion at some later date to refer to some of them more in detail.

As I said at the outset, my desire has not been to state the entire case against Secretary Bryan, but simply by discussing at some length the history of his relations with a small and relatively obscure sister republic to show the point of view which dominates his public service. The man whom he sent to Santo Domingo is said by so competent and dependable an observer as Mr. Vick to be directly responsible for the revolution that is now raging there. And yet Mr. Sullivan was probably not the worst of the Bryan brood of "diplomats" that went out a year and a half ago to Latin America. We should take warning before even worse results have befallen us. The years 1914 and 1915 will perhaps be reckoned in history as the most momentous of all time. Mighty transitions occur almost daily and pass almost unnoticed. The place of the United States in the world remains to be estab-

lished. Peace or war may hang upon the word of our representatives at home or abroad. Our prosperity and indeed our very existence may depend upon the nod of the President and his chosen assistants. Is it not, then, the right and obligation of every thinking American to demand that the United States be given a Secretary of State who, by ability, unswerving attention to duty, experience, and disinterestedness, may in these most critical of all days be worthy of being compared with the great men in that office upon whom the country has so often depended and of whom it has always been proud?

Some of the newspaper editorials to which I have referred are as follows:

[New York Tribune, Jan. 16, 1915.]

A SECRETARY OF STATE WITHOUT SENSITIVENESS AND WITHOUT SHAME.

No one acquainted with Mr. Bryan's true character could have expected him to wince at the publication of the shameful Vick letter. Since he became Secretary of State he has betrayed a strange lack of sensitiveness to his surroundings. It was a nonappreciation of the delicacies of conduct and traditions of dignity respected by other Secretaries of State which led him into his grotesque exploits on the Chautauqua circuit. His announcement that he felt obliged to supplement his \$12,000 salary with the gate receipts of barnstorming lectures was only the outcropping of a deep streak of coarseness in his makeup. That coarseness has cropped out again and again in his attitude toward appointments to the diplomatic corps. He has tried to treat all the officers he could lay his hands on as party patronage. He is the only Secretary of State in our time who ever set out openly to loot the foreign service. When Mr. Gresham was Secretary in Mr. Cleveland's second term he allowed Josiah Quincy to loot the consular offices. But never before in any excess of partisan covetousness has the head of the department dreamed of sending to a diplomatic agent executing in a foreign country a trust for that country a shameful demand for patronage odds and ends such as Mr. Bryan served on Mr. Walker W. Vick in San Domingo.

"Now that you have arrived and are acquainting yourself with the situation, can you let me know what positions you have at your disposal with which to reward deserving Democrats," wrote the brazen spoilsman who is now filling the place held by Root, Hay, Olney, Blaine, Bayard, Fish, and Seward. Secretaries of State in the old days may have incidentally looked out for party friends in making appointments; but they gave nine-tenths to ninety-nine one-hundredths of their time and thought to the weighty affairs of diplomacy. It is Mr. Bryan's unpardonable offense that in these days of far higher standards of fitness and merit in public appointments he has given nine-tenths to ninety-nine one-hundredths of his time and thought (when not lecturing for private profit) to using the foreign service as an agency to diminish unemployment among former Democratic campaign workers.

Mr. Bryan is not abashed by the publication of the Vick letter. On the contrary, he glories in his spoilsmanship. And why should he not? He simply applied in San Domingo (although the status of the financial commission there is somewhat exceptional) the same policy which filled most of the South American and Central American missions with Bryan protégés entirely innocent of diplomatic experience. In order to pay political debts hanging over from the campaign of 1908 he turned out of office American ministers who had risen from the secretarial grades and had established their capacity as diplomats. It was the same policy which forced the retirement of Ambassador William W. Rockhill, an expert who had spent most of his active life in diplomatic work. Making a place at Petrograd for Pindell, of Peoria, on the terms enlarged on in the celebrated letters attributed to Senator "JIM HAM" LEWIS differed in no essential from the attempted loading down of the Dominican Commission with "deserving Democrats" of small-fry caliber.

Mr. Bryan's incumbency in the State Department has been a failure and a scandal because he has never realized the dignity and importance of his office. He has made American diplomacy a Chautauqua circuit joke. But the fault is not exclusively his. Mr. Wilson has been obliged to tolerate him to a certain extent. Yet that tolerance has been too often flavored with sympathy.

Mr. Bryan's crude spoilsmanship has been permitted to go unre-buked, and even the Vick letter, which the Secretary now glories in, can hardly put a greater strain on the President's capacity for covering over his subordinate's vagaries than have a dozen previous incidents equally illuminative of Mr. Bryan's unfitness for his post. The Pindell letters were repudiated, yet they showed just as clearly as does the Vick document that American diplomacy will be without honor either here or abroad so long as its conduct remains in Mr. Bryan's hands. Mr. Wilson, however, can not escape responsibility for the continuance of the Bryan régime.

[New York World, Jan. 16, 1915.]

MR. BRYAN'S LETTER.

President Wilson's exultation over his success through the agency of postmasters in getting jobs for 30,000 idle workmen was cold and formal in comparison with Secretary Bryan's delight at the prospect that he was going to find official places in Santo Domingo for some of his worthy friends. "You have had enough experience in politics," he wrote to Mr. Vick, American receiver of Dominican customs, "to know how valuable workers are when the campaign is on, and how difficult it is to find suitable rewards for all the deserving."

Mr. Vick's experience, of course, must be brief and uneventful in comparison with Mr. Bryan's, and so anything that the latter may have to say as to the difficulty of rewarding deserving Democrats must be accepted as the well-matured views of a veteran. In truth, while much fault has been found with the Secretary's conduct of the State Department, no one can say that he has ever permitted diplomacy or chautauquas to interfere with the pleasant task of getting offices for such meritorious Democrats as have adhered loyally to his political fortunes.

Let us all admit at once that no other distinguished American has ever shown more industry and gratitude in his humane desire to reduce unemployment among free-silver Democrats; but why did he have to write a letter on the subject?

[New York Herald, Jan. 16, 1915.]

In his letter to Mr. Vick Mr. Bryan reveals himself a spoilsman of the same stripe as Mr. Charles F. Murphy and Mr. Roger C. Sullivan. The

only persons who will be at all surprised by the revelation are those who have been taking him at his own estimate of himself shining through smug professions of political righteousness while chautauquing.

The fact is that Mr. Bryan's main business as Secretary of State has been job hunting for his henchmen, always with preference for those who were true to the "sacred ratio" in 1896.

The revelation of the Vick letter will not injure Mr. Bryan in the eyes of office-hunting Democrats. They, as he, are firmly wedded to the Jacksonian doctrine that to the victors belong the spoils.

But, as President Wilson made clear at Indianapolis, the independent voter holds the balance of power in American politics these days, and the independent voter expects service—not job hunting or mere office holding—from officials of his Government.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Courier-Citizen, Jan. 18, 1915.]

BRYAN TO VICK.

The placid and unctuous Mr. Bryan must be a bit disturbed at the howl that is going up at the discovery of his letter to W. W. Vick, late a receiver of customs in San Domingo, in the course of which he asked that official to look around and see if there were not some more fat jobs to bestow on deserving Democrats from the United States. The text of the letter was something like this:

"Now that you have arrived and are acquainting yourself with the situation, can you not let me know what positions you have at your disposal with which to reward deserving Democrats? Whenever you desire a suggestion from me in regard to a man for any place there call on me."

"You have had enough experience in politics to know how valuable workers are when the campaign is on and how difficult it is to find suitable rewards for all the deserving. I do not know to what extent a knowledge of Spanish is necessary for employees. Let me know what is required, together with the salary, and when appointments are likely to be made."

Mr. Bryan is at least frank about it, nor does he now make any attempt to disavow his letter. It is his doctrine that, in the administration of a sacred trust conferred by politics, even in other countries than our own, the great and first commandment is to bestow the offices on the deserving party workers. If, in the process, the choice falls upon a man of ability as well, it is a happy accident and the public service does not in that case suffer. If in other cases it does suffer—as it did in some of the instances in San Domingo—never mind; the deserving Democrats have at least been paid off, and that's what we're here for!

The chorus of protest against this candid confession of a super-Jacksonian doctrine of spoilsmanship comes from the leading journals of both great parties. Mr. Bryan is frankly informed, for example, by the Springfield Republican that he has inflicted an "irreparable injury" on the whole Wilson administration, and the demand for his immediate resignation comes from about every quarter. The chances are, however, that Mr. Bryan will not resign, and that Mr. Wilson will not ask him to. Mr. Wilson is about as fatuously pachydermatous in such matters as Mr. Bryan himself and will probably go right along, not only tolerating Mr. Bryan but blandly approving all his works, including the letter to Mr. Vick on the primal necessity of putting none but faithful Democrats on guard, no matter what becomes of the good of the service. Of course, there is serious danger of splitting the party by breaking with Mr. Bryan, but there is a danger no less serious in keeping in with him. The administration is in a position not unlike that of the soldier who remarked: "I'll be hanged if I don't, and I'll be shot if I do." Mr. Wilson can not afford to retain Mr. Bryan, whose presence is increasingly a millstone hung about the administrative neck; and yet he can not afford to come to an open breach with him. It is this which makes the Springfield Republican—a strong friend of the President and of his general type—to remark gloomily that the Vick letter from Mr. Bryan's hand has done "irreparable injury" to the whole Wilson régime. If it hasn't, it should.

The trouble with the ancient ideal of partisan spoilsmanship professed so candidly by Mr. Bryan is that so many pesky independents in these days don't accept it, and their approval is highly desirable to secure. Inasmuch as it is they who commonly dictate the result of elections, by voting this way or that according to their belief, it ill becomes the party benefited by their momentary favor to take it as an ample warrant for a saturnalia of spoils mongering, whether that party be the Republican or the Democratic. Mr. Wilson in particular, being a "minority President," has small ground for assuming that a charter was conferred upon him in 1912 by the popular will to use the Government patronage to reward Bryanistic Democrats. In a word, Mr. Bryan's retrospective gratitude is outrageously bad politics, as well as discreditable statesmanship. It can do nothing but ruin his chief, for the sake of paying off a lot of Mr. Bryan's own political debts.

[Lowell (Mass.) Courier-Citizen, Jan. 19, 1915, from the Springfield Republican.]

MR. BRYAN, ARCH SPOILSMAN.

The very grave damage Secretary Bryan has done the Wilson administration by his staggering letter on jobs for "deserving Democrats," written to Mr. Vick, formerly United States receiver of customs in San Domingo, is irreparable. Nothing Mr. Bryan has ever said or done crystallizes his repulsively Jacksonian spoils principles like this letter.

It is nothing new that he is still living in the political atmosphere of Van Buren, Marcy, and Thurlow Weed in matters relating to the civil service. With all of his zeal for "reform," Mr. Bryan has frankly remained a spoilsman curiously filled with absurd notions to the effect that "life tenure" even in minor offices was undemocratic and that party workers should be rewarded at the expense of administrative efficiency in public office.

But the Vick letter is more of a shock than it could have been when Mr. Bryan first ran for President, nearly 20 years ago, upon a platform that gave precious little encouragement to civil service reformers. When he was the third time a candidate, in 1908, he seemed to have become more civilized in this particular, for the Denver platform drafted by himself declared: "The laws pertaining to the civil service should be honestly and rigidly enforced to the end that merit and ability shall be the standard of appointment and promotion rather than services rendered to a political party."

Finally in office, although not in the position of chief, Mr. Bryan has used all his influence in the administration to reward "deserving Democrats" solely because of "services rendered to a political party." That he has been an unblinking job hunter for party friends, even at the expense of San Domingo, is proved so conclusively by the Vick

letter that he defiantly acknowledges its authenticity. "I am glad to have the public know," he said yesterday, "that I appreciate the services of those who work in politics and feel an interest in seeing them rewarded, and, as Mr. Vick received his appointment for political work, I thought he was a good man to address and express my opinion on the subject."

Mr. Bryan's pachydermous and benighted attitude, it is needless to point out, outrages that powerful sentiment in the country which sustains the merit as against the political principle in filling administrative offices, a sentiment which is the product of a generation of laborious agitation and which will not suffer the civil service of the United States to be cast back into the muck heap of spoils mongering without a bitter protest and struggle. Mr. Bryan's offense is magnified many times because of his high position in the administration, for he has an influence second only to that of the President himself, and such unblushing utterances from him must deeply alarm as well as affront the best citizenship of the land.

If Mr. Bryan "made" the Wilson administration, it is very possible that he will also destroy its chances of indorsement by the people in the next presidential election. His political support of the President has thus far been of incalculable value in maintaining a strong administration party in Congress, and it is virtually impossible for Mr. Wilson to continue in a party leadership that admits of no challenge without Mr. Bryan's sincere and cordial aid. That is why the damage done by the Vick letter is irreparable. The President can not force the retirement of Mr. Bryan without dividing his party and wrecking his administration.

[From the Boston Advertiser, Jan. 19, 1915.]

BRYAN MUST GO.

We have been disposed, while the present war in Europe was going on, to make every possible allowance of charity and forbearance for the blunders of the present administration. But in the name of national decency and national honor it must be plain to every self-respecting American to-day that William Jennings Bryan should not be retained in his present post, at the head of the Department of State, a moment longer than it will take President Wilson to demand formally and in some public fashion Mr. Bryan's resignation.

It is useless to try to mince matters. Bryan has shown himself unfit for the position. His ideals of filling the diplomatic and consular service with his impossible creatures of the Sullivan stripe; his determined attempts to slather the whitewash brush over the worst scandals that have protruded themselves and that now smell to high heaven; these things make it impossible for President Wilson to retain him any longer without losing his own self-respect, as well as the respect of the people of this country.

Not only must Secretary Bryan resign; he must resign at once, in such prompt and sudden fashion as will leave no room for doubt that he goes at the demand of the President and of the American people alike.

The Santo Dominican scandal is the worst exposure of the State Department's blundering, but it is not the only one. Mr. Bryan's appointees have been making trouble in Europe, too—how much we can learn probably only at the close of the war. Bumptious, ignorant, open to suspicion on other grounds, the antics of some of these men have failed to attract much public notice, only because graver issues are at stake over there. The way in which the State Department tried to force Ambassador Herrick from his post at the time when his services were vitally necessary is an old story.

But the Santo Dominican exposures present the most enlightenment because this is the only case in which all the facts have been brought out plainly. We have, at the outset, a deal of Tammany men who wanted to exploit Santo Domingo to fill their own pockets. We have these unscrupulous men picking their tools and telling Bryan whom to put there. We have some of these men swaggering around among the punctilious people of the little island with the manners of barroom toughs and the morals of gold-brick operators. We see the honest Americans who still remain in office in the islands protesting—not to Bryan alone, but to the President, too, it should be remembered—with the result that the honest men had to resign to retain their self-respect. And when men came to Bryan with the proofs, we have seen the chilly reception which they had to endure.

But in public, while all this was going on, we saw Mr. Bryan—saintly as a Pecksniff or a Chadband—preaching "our obligations to the people of the Latin-Americas," expatiating on our obligations to treat them with scrupulous honesty and the highest ideals of Christian statesmanship. The unctuous hypocrisy shown in the contrast between public profession and private performance have been made patent to the people of Latin America much longer than to the people of North America. At this time of all times, when the American people have begun to desire the closest possible relations of friendship and honorable amity with the States of Latin America, it is self-evident that Bryan must not be kept in office a day longer than is necessary to complete the plans for his ignominious exit. The good faith and the honor of the American Nation demand his hasty and undignified expulsion from the State Department.

This can not be a partisan question. Neither the President nor the Democratic Party can afford for an instant to stand by or to defend Bryan. The facts in the case, the clear, convincing testimony of all the principals in the Santo Domingo investigation, bear incontestable testimony to Mr. Bryan's frantic use of the whitewash brush to conceal the facts from the American people. There was even given out from the State Department what purported to be a summary of an "impartial investigation" conducted by some disinterested men clearing Minister Sullivan; and on the basis of that investigation the State Department attempted to close the case. It now appears that the alleged investigation was a downright fake. Not one of the men mentioned had consented to touch the affair, and certainly not one gave Mr. Bryan the right to use his name in that connection.

The frantic appeals of Mr. Bryan to American agents in Santo Domingo to let him know at once of any opportunity to fill the service with his spoils men, his evident willingness to crowd political derelicts into the public service, these are among the other bad features of his rule in the State Department. An out-and-out spoilsman of the Bourbon type, packing public offices with the political wrecks who were "down and out," his influence upon our public service will not soon be cleansed away unless his appointees are sent packing, too, when he goes. In any case, however, he must go; and he can not go any too soon.

[Lowell (Mass.) Courier-Citizen, Jan. 20, 1915, from the Providence Journal.]

"A VERY NASTY MESS."

A witness before the commissioner appointed by the President to investigate the behavior of the American minister to Santo Domingo, "considers this a very nasty mess."

It is one of the nastiest that cheap politics has ever produced. The nastiness is magnified because the cheap politics have their source in the highest quarters, the State Department. And the offense to public sentiment is aggravated by the fact that the consequences are not alone of domestic concern, but involve our foreign relations.

The national good faith has been discredited by the cheap politician in whom the President has chosen to confide it—Bryan. An intelligent administration of the State Department has not been looked for from the beginning. The neglect and blundering of Bryan have simply justified general expectation. But the American people might have supposed that the administration would be clean-handed.

Santo Domingo is as remote from the mind of the average American as Tibet. A nasty mess down there might have escaped public attention had it not become too nasty for one of the administration's own representatives to endure. Much of the testimony so far furnished is ex parte. But, at least—considering that it is out of the mouths of Democrats, testifying before a Democratic investigator and relating entirely to Democratic officials—it will not be impugned on the ground of partisan prejudice.

That accidental exhibit of documentary evidence—the Bryan letter to Vick, receiver of customs for Santo Domingo, imploring assistance to find jobs for "deserving Democrats" on the Dominican Government pay roll—is an unanswerable indictment. The disclosure amounts to a contemptible abuse of public trust. Minister Sullivan's case becomes of secondary importance. The President should call for Bryan's resignation from the Cabinet. It is no longer a question of fitness, but of decency.

Washington's tutelage of Santo Domingo was undertaken some 10 years ago. The arrangement is that an American representative has charge of the Dominican customs; and he turns over to the Dominican Government 45 per cent, withholding 55 per cent for the liquidation of the foreign debt. There is no meddling with domestic affairs, no restraint on the habit of getting up revolutions—but revolutionists must let the customhouses alone. Santo Domingo's credit is being restored, and the menace of foreign intervention for the collection of debts is removed.

This prosperity seems to have invited a descent on Santo Domingo by contractors of the Tammany stripe. The charges against Minister Sullivan indicate that the scheme was to organize a monopoly of public works down there. Santo Domingo was to be exploited. The treasury, which the Government at Washington has heretofore tried to conserve, was to be looted.

Not a "service to mankind," but "a very nasty mess."

[From the New York World, Jan. 21, 1915.]

BRYANIZED DOLLAR DIPLOMACY.

The State Department under the dollar-diplomacy ideas of Secretary Knox may have been an agency for the easy use of financial freebooters in tropical America or elsewhere. But the State Department under William J. Bryan is giving instances of equal subservency.

Whatever else may develop in the investigation of James M. Sullivan's appointment as minister to Santo Domingo, its absurd unfitness has already been amply proved, as well as its intimate relations with scheming contractors and exploiters. What Sullivan at the worst may be in this unsavory mess remains to be determined. But what Sullivan at the best has been shown to be is the tool of those contract workers of the Tammany political school who secured his appointment.

Sullivan's qualifications for a diplomatic post were so notoriously lacking that he himself apparently never dreamed of seeking such a position until he was put up to it by the Jarvis-Banco Nacional interests in the island. Secretary Bryan could not have been fooled in the first instance if he had been alive to his duties. But his later whitewashing of Sullivan and suppression of evidence of unfitness forced upon his attention show that from first to last his chief object had been to take care of "deserving Democrats."

The scandal has reached a stage where it must command the anxious attention of the President.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Courier-Citizen, Jan. 23, 1915.]

SLAMMING MR. BRYAN.

There have been lots of cutting things said about William Jennings Bryan, first and last, by his political opponents, all the way from 1896 to 1915; but it remains for a vallant supporter of the Democratic administration to hand him the most staggering blow yet delivered since he was revealed by his own correspondence to Mr. Vick as "the prince of job hunters." Let us quote a few paragraphs from the editorial recently printed by the New York Nation (and Evening Post) in which the matter was considered, merely adding that this differs only in bitterness of criticism from similar comments printed in other journals quite as friendly to President Wilson and his party:

"This letter is probably the most disgraceful thing ever written by any American Secretary of State. The trail of the spoilsman is over it all. Note the date, August 20, 1913. At that time many critical matters were pressing upon the attention of the State Department. The Mexican volcano was rumbling toward explosion. Yet the Secretary of State, his anterooms and corridors stuffed as they were for weeks with political dependents of his clamoring for jobs, was giving his thought to offices, and began looking around in helpless Santo Domingo to find 'suitable rewards' for those who had done party work for him. Such a letter on official State Department paper! Rummage the archives from the beginning, and you will find nothing so unworthy, so humiliating, so near an approach to the infinitely mean."

"What makes the affair peculiarly contemptible is the fact that Mr. Bryan was trying to get jobs for his friends in a service which the United States had undertaken as a solemn trust. On that subject no one had made finer flourishes than Mr. Bryan himself. We were to prove the 'disinterested' friendship of this Nation. We were to remove suspicion by setting our face like a flint against anything that looked like exploitation or self-seeking. And after all these noble words, this indecent request: 'Let me know what positions you have at your disposal!' The former receiver of Dominican customs has put in evidence what were his instructions from a former Secretary of State."

Mr. Root enjoined the receiver that his work was essentially that of a trustee. He was to consider himself as an administrator of trust funds. As a matter of fact, until the advent of Mr. Bryan in the State Department, there was no hint that politics had been allowed to sway the Dominican service discharged by us. Certainly there were no such scandals as have ever since been crawling to the surface. But why talk of scandals among subordinates when the chief scandal of all has been brought directly home to the Secretary of State?

It was known long ago that no comparison existed between such a Secretary of State as Mr. Bryan and such a Secretary of State as ELIHU ROOT. The latter is probably the most accomplished statesman we have living among us to-day, and Mr. Bryan about as underheaded a public official as ever got into prominence. Yet Mr. Root was a rich and wicked corporation lawyer, and Mr. Bryan is a poor and pious lover of his fellow men! What a pity to have the latter shown up as so disregarding of a sacred governmental trust, in contradistinction to the former! But the Nation goes on to say:

"Admit that Mr. Bryan wrote the letter without one twinge. What does that prove? What but that the Secretary of State is so dense where he ought to be delicate, so callous where he ought to be sensitive, that he does things to shock the general sense of propriety and of morals without the glimmer of an idea that he is giving offense? Than this no severer condemnation could be passed upon a public man. We saw a revelation of such dull apprehension on Mr. Bryan's part when he went off Chautauqua-circuiting for money and fell into a rage when he found that the mass of the people either made fun of him or denounced him for making rags of the dignity of his office. That was bad enough, but his spoils-grabbing letter is worse. It is worse in itself, and it is worse as revealing the kind of appalling unconsciousness with which Mr. Bryan does discreditable things."

That's just it, exactly. Mr. Bryan hadn't the remotest idea he was not doing right. He even "laughed" when admitting that he wrote the letter, apparently never dreaming that he was bringing down the house upon his own devoted head by his effrontery. He must, in view of the way the entire country has jumped on him since, be a very perplexed and troubled man—for nothing bothers one who is sincerely anxious to do right so much as the overwhelming verdict that he has done a thing so grossly and obviously wrong as to invite universal condemnation. Mr. Bryan must be both puzzled and distressed, but it is highly improbable that even now he sees anything wrong in what he wrote or did. Such is the obtuseness of the man. He ought to resign, of course, and Mr. Wilson should not rest until he has compelled him to; but that either man will do either thing is too good to believe.

[From the Boston Advertiser, Feb. 3, 1915.]

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

When the astounding revelations were first made, as to the policies under which the State Department was conducted, we hoped that President Wilson would act in the only possible effectual way to end that scandal. But he is showing himself as narrow a partisan as Bryan himself. Whatever Bryan stands for—and we sincerely regret that it is so—President Wilson stands for.

When it was first known that Bryan had made the State Department an employment bureau for "deserving Democrats"; when his plaint was first made public "how valuable workers are when the campaign is on, and how difficult it is to find suitable rewards for the deserving," the public looked to see the President in righteous protest against peddling the places in our diplomatic service as the reward of political jobbery. Beers, Vick, Pulliam, and all the others say, however, that all the facts were laid before the President long before the general public knew of the scandal. And it appears that these men were told either to keep their mouths shut or to get out of office.

When Sullivan astounded Latin Americans by holding his official levees in a condition of semideshabille the protests went to the White House. When the grave charges of political influence in the Dominican finances were formulated, they went to the White House. Now that a deficit of something like \$15,000,000 is reported, and a new scandal is certain to be unearthed, we are told that the White House was warned last year of the dangers of mixing politics and business. But the President has stood resolutely by Bryan, because of his sympathy with Bryan's Bourbonism. And he stood by Sullivan, because the former associate of "Bald Jack" Rose was a Bryan politician.

In the notable speech made by W. M. Fullerton this week at Ford Hall the speaker declared that it was of absolutely vital importance to the United States at once to reach a definite diplomatic agreement, a settled understanding, with the nations of South and Central America. With a reticence in itself significant as to the basis for that warning, Mr. Fullerton, from his thorough knowledge of secret diplomacy in Europe, said that there could be "nothing more important" to the future safety of the United States.

Yet to-day we find all Latin America bitter over the revelations made as to the way in which Bryan has been peddling his offices in those countries as prizes among the "down and out" political fraternity of the Royal Bryan Rooters. When it is vitally necessary that our commercial relations should be closest, when all this hemisphere should be acting as one, we find the Bryan men in Latin America utterly without influence, utterly without initiative, absolutely a drag on every vital undertaking. What has been done that counts has been in spite of the bitter feeling which the blunderings of Bryan's loot of the offices have caused. Every business man in this country knows it. Every business man has been astounded by the indifference of the President to one of the worst scandals in national politics to-day.

And the pity of it is that good men in no less than 22 Latin American posts were displaced to make room for Bryan's "heelers."

Is the explanation of the President's astonishing attitude to be found in his recent Indianapolis speech?

A year ago all of us believed that Woodrow Wilson was the last man in public life to tolerate political rascality, to allow the public offices to be traded for political support. But the Woodrow Wilson of a year ago is not the man who spoke at Indianapolis, who threatened with "political extinction" every Democrat who dared to protest against the growing scandals of this administration. Reluctant as most of us have been to reach that conclusion, is there much room for doubt that the President, in order to make sure of a renomination, has determined to stand by the disgraceful Bryan policy through thick and thin; to keep him in office in spite of every new exposure; to sacrifice every consideration of high ideals in our foreign service for the sake of Bryan's support in the next Democratic national convention?

In taking that stand, the President shoulders the odium of the whole business. He has chosen deliberately. And with that choice must end his former promise of patriotic statesmanship.

[From the New York Sun, Feb. 18, 1915.]

THE NEW ERA IN WASHINGTON AND CARNEGIE HALL.

Owing to the exigencies of newspaper mechanics the Sun was prevented on Tuesday evening from assembling in juxtaposition two interesting announcements whose mutually illuminative significance obviously requires that they should be read together. We now bestow upon them that contiguity they so richly merit. The first of this twain was in a news dispatch:

"WORK TOO MUCH FOR BRYAN—SECRETARY ENLISTS AID OF FORMER TAFT OFFICIAL."

"WASHINGTON, February 16.

"Because of the rapidly multiplying problems confronting the State Department in connection with the European war Secretary Bryan has been forced to enlist the aid of Chandler P. Anderson, counselor to the department in the Taft administration, to act as an additional adviser."

"Announcement to this effect was made by Mr. Bryan this afternoon." The second member of the pair was in the space devoted to advertising the amusements offered by far-sighted and enterprising entrepreneurs for the entertainment of this town:

"CARNEGIE HALL, WED. EVE., FEB. 24—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY BRYAN ON 'THE NEW ERA'—SEATS, \$1.50 TO 25C. AT BOX OFFICE."

The proud consciousness of having done our duty is the sole reward we crave for the unsought and unpaid repetition of this notice, and we sincerely trust that the presence of Mr. Anderson in the Department of State will render it unnecessary for the Secretary of State to cancel his lecture engagement, no matter what the international situation may be on February 24.

In addition to the excerpts which appear in the above-quoted editorial of the Lowell (Mass.) Courier-Citizen, dated January 23, 1915, The Nation says further:

The shocking letter by Secretary Bryan put in evidence in the Santo Domingo inquiry, was really a by-product of that investigation. What is being looked into, at the President's direction, is the doings of Minister Sullivan. He has been charged with grave improprieties and derelictions. When he was appointed there was much lifting of eyebrows at the choice of a man with such a record for such a post. The position was one of the few reserved by long custom for colored men, but the Department of State explained that it wanted a man of special competence to deal with the delicate and complex questions arising in the Dominican Republic. This was felt at the time to be a pretense. Sullivan's selection and his career in Santo Domingo make it a plain sham and fraud. And the unblushing way in which Mr. Bryan at once appealed to Mr. Vick, the new American receiver of Dominican customs, to let him know how many "deserving Democrats," at what salaries, could be foisted upon the Dominican service, shows what was the chief thing in his mind.

We know of no defense of Mr. Bryan in this matter which will not heighten his offense. It may be said that he was not aware that he was doing anything to be ashamed of. He never did take any interest in civil-service reform. The whole-hog principle always seemed about right to him. It was good Nebraska fashion to peddle out all available offices to one's friends. Nobody had so many needy friends as Mr. Bryan when he went to Washington. They were fairly encamped about him. Their pleading eyes looked up to him to be fed. How could he resist the appeal of his old campaigners who sat "three" in a chair in front of his door? And if jobs were to be had in Santo Domingo, why not go straight after them?

Those who, in their admirable simplicity, do God's will and know it not, are the subject of high praise by the poet. But what is to be said of those who do the will of the wicked and know it not? This at least may be said, that they will be regarded by intelligent Americans as having committed the unforgivable political sin, and to be unfit to represent them in high office. It is a calm judgment that Mr. Bryan has exhausted his usefulness to the administration, and is now a burden upon it. President Wilson must be wishing that the Secretary would write another letter—one containing his resignation.

APPENDIX.

1907.

CONVENTION PROVIDING FOR THE ASSISTANCE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE COLLECTION AND APPLICATION OF THE CUSTOMS REVENUES OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.

CONCLUDED FEBRUARY 8, 1907; RATIFICATION ADVISED BY THE SENATE FEBRUARY 25, 1907; RATIFIED BY THE PRESIDENT JUNE 22, 1907; RATIFICATIONS EXCHANGED JULY 8, 1907; PROCLAIMED JULY 25, 1907.

Articles.

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| I. Receiver. | IV. Accounts of receiver. |
| II. Payment of customs revenues. | V. Ratification. |
| III. Public debt. | |

Whereas during disturbed political conditions in the Dominican Republic debts and claims have been created, some by regular and some by revolutionary governments, many of doubtful validity in whole or in part, and amounting in all to over \$30,000,000, nominal or face value;

And whereas the same conditions have prevented the peaceable and continuous collection and application of national revenues for payment of interest or principal of such debts or for liquidation and settlement of such claims; and the said debts and claims continually increase by accretion of interest and are a grievous burden upon the people of the Dominican Republic and a barrier to their improvement and prosperity;

And whereas the Dominican Government has now effected a conditional adjustment and settlement of said debts and claims under which all its foreign creditors have agreed to accept about \$12,407,000 for debts and claims amounting to about \$21,184,000 of nominal or face value, and the holders of internal debts or claims of about \$2,028,258 nominal or face value have agreed to accept about \$645,827 therefor, and the remaining holders of internal debts or claims on the same basis as the assents already given will receive about \$2,400,000 therefor, which sum the Dominican Government has fixed and determined as the amount which it will pay to such remaining internal debt holders; making the total payments under such adjustment and settlement, including interest as adjusted and claims not yet liquidated, amount to not more than about \$17,000,000;

And whereas a part of such plan of settlement is the issue and sale of bonds of the Dominican Republic to the amount of \$20,000,000, bearing 5 per cent interest payable in 50 years and redeemable after

10 years at 102½ and requiring payment of at least 1 per cent per annum for amortization, the proceeds of said bonds, together with such funds as are now deposited for the benefit of creditors from customs revenues of the Dominican Republic heretofore received, after payment of the expenses of such adjustment, to be applied first to the payment of said debts and claims as adjusted, and second out of the balance remaining to the retirement and extinction of certain concessions and harbor monopolies which are a burden and hindrance to the commerce of the country, and third, the entire balance still remaining to the construction of certain railroads and bridges and other public improvements necessary to the industrial development of the country;

And whereas the whole of said plan is conditioned and dependent upon the assistance of the United States in the collection of customs revenues of the Dominican Republic and the application thereof so far as necessary to the interest upon and the amortization and redemption of said bonds, and the Dominican Republic has requested the United States to give and the United States is willing to give such assistance;

The Dominican Government, represented by its minister of state for foreign relations, Emiliano Tejera, and its minister of state for finance and commerce, Federico Velasquez H., and the United States Government, represented by Thomas C. Dawson, minister resident and consul general of the United States to the Dominican Republic, have agreed;

I. That the President of the United States shall appoint a general receiver of Dominican customs, who, with such assistant receivers and other employees of the receivership as shall be appointed by the President of the United States in his discretion, shall collect all the customs duties accruing at the several customs houses of the Dominican Republic until the payment or retirement of any and all bonds issued by the Dominican Government in accordance with the plan and under the limitations as to terms and amounts hereinbefore recited; and said general receiver shall apply the sums so collected as follows:

First, to paying the expenses of the receivership; second, to the payment of interest upon said bonds; third, to the payment of the annual sums provided for amortization of said bonds, including interest upon all bonds held in sinking fund; fourth, to the purchase and cancellation or the retirement and cancellation pursuant to the terms thereof of any of said bonds as may be directed by the Dominican Government; fifth, the remainder to be paid to the Dominican Government.

The method of distributing the current collections of revenue in order to accomplish the application thereof as hereinbefore provided shall be as follows:

The expenses of the receivership shall be paid by the receiver as they arise. The allowance to the general receiver and his assistants for the expenses of collecting the revenues shall not exceed 5 per cent unless by agreement between the two Governments.

On the first day of each calendar month the sum of \$100,000 shall be paid over by the receiver to the fiscal agent of the loan, and the remaining collection of the last preceding month shall be paid over to the Dominican Government or applied to the sinking fund for the purchase or redemption of bonds, as the Dominican Government shall direct: *Provided*, That in case the customs revenues collected by the general receiver shall in any year exceed the sum of \$3,000,000, one-half of the surplus above such sum of \$3,000,000 shall be applied to the sinking fund for the redemption of bonds.

II. The Dominican Government will provide by law for the payment of all customs duties to the general receiver and his assistants, and will give to them all needful aid and assistance and full protection to the extent of its powers. The Government of the United States will give to the general receiver and his assistants such protection as it may find to be requisite for the performance of their duties.

III. Until the Dominican Republic has paid the whole amount of the bonds of the debt its public debt shall not be increased except by previous agreement between the Dominican Government and the United States. A like agreement shall be necessary to modify the import duties, it being an indispensable condition for the modification of such duties that the Dominican Executive demonstrate and that the President of the United States recognize that, on the basis of exportations and importations to the like amount and the like character during the two years preceding that in which it is desired to make such modification, the total net customs receipts would at such altered rates of duties have been for each of such two years in excess of the sum of \$2,000,000 United States gold.

IV. The accounts of the general receiver shall be rendered monthly to the Contaduría General of the Dominican Republic and to the State Department of the United States, and shall be subject to examination and verification by the appropriate officers of the Dominican and the United States Governments.

V. This agreement shall take effect after its approval by the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the Dominican Republic.

Done in four originals, two being in the English language and two in the Spanish, and the representatives of the high contracting parties signing them in the city of Santo Domingo this 8th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1907.

THOMAS C. DAWSON,
EMILIANO TEJERA,
FEDERICO VELASQUEZ H.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when I came into the House this morning I did not have the slightest idea of injecting myself into any discussion on the topics which form the subject of to-day's business. I listened to the arraignment of Mr. Sullivan by my friend from Massachusetts, and I have arisen to shed some light upon the subject, not because I am interested in the slightest way in the matter, but simply because I happen to know something about it.

For one of the standing of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], his attack on Mr. Sullivan on this floor was, to say the least, most amazing. I believe that ordinarily when one talks about a subject in a way that would involve the character of another man, he should at least in the interest of justice inform himself of the facts in the case.

I make two objections to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS]. First of all, the matter is now under investigation by a committee which has not yet finished taking the testimony; and, second, that the testimony

at hand is mostly one-sided and against the minister to Santo Domingo, and that the gentleman did not submit even all of that, although he might without much effort had laid his hands upon it.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes; with pleasure; because we want to have this thing correct.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman realizes that in these days the public must depend for enlightenment largely upon newspaper accounts of current events, and the gentleman knows to what extent newspapers are quoted and used on the floor. I have undertaken to read everything bearing on the case of Mr. Sullivan. I have undertaken to make no statement based merely upon my own inference or opinion. I shall be glad to furnish references to every statement I have made, and the sources thereof. In 30 or 40 minutes, of course, I could not quote verbatim the enormous mass of testimony. I tried to give a fair résumé of the testimony without even discussing the alleged contract frauds, the exact facts in connection with which seem to be in dispute.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman from New Jersey yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HAMILL. I will.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Inasmuch as the reports are newspaper talk and fragmentary, is not that a greater reason why the gentleman should refrain from giving it until the official testimony is in?

Mr. ROGERS. All the testimony has been taken except the defense of Mr. Sullivan himself at Santo Domingo.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Then the gentleman is prejudging his case.

Mr. ROGERS. I am not; I have given the uncontroverted testimony of Democrats—of Mr. Vick, a favorite son of the Democratic administration and the personal representative of the Secretary of War.

Mr. HAMILL. The gentleman says he has read all the available newspaper accounts. Let me say that he could not have done so. He speaks of Mr. Sullivan's connection as counsel with the case of "Bald Jack" Rose. Does he find anything in that which would reflect upon him? Consider that Mr. Roor, who committed this sacred trust of Santo Domingo to somebody or other to carry out, was, so I understand, one of the counsel who defended William Tweed when he was tried and convicted of certain criminal charges. Again, if the gentleman had read one of the New York papers—I think the New York Sun—he would have found that Mr. Whitman, then New York district attorney, but now governor of New York, wrote a letter of indorsement for Mr. Sullivan, declaring that he aided the State and that his conduct in that case was very commendable.

Mr. ROGERS. I did not criticize the gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HAMILL. Not just now, not until I finish the statement. Furthermore, when "Bald Jack" Rose took the stand—I have not the honor of the acquaintance of that distinguished personage, who, I believe, is now engaged on the lecture platform, and I am merely concerned with what he said—when he took the stand, he said, in effect, that he had a grudge against Sullivan, either then or after the trial, and when asked why, he said it was because Sullivan insisted that he tell the whole truth, and he did not want to tell the whole truth. Is there anything dishonorable about that? Let us be fair, since we are talking about men's characters.

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, the gentleman wants to be fair—

Mr. HAMILL. Absolutely, and if I am not it is unintentional, just as I feel that if the gentleman is not fair it is unintentional on his part.

Mr. ROGERS. The only mention I made of "Bald Jack" Rose was to refer to the fact that Sullivan had been his defender in the trial, and to say that that circumstance could not have been the reason for his selection as minister to the Dominican Republic; I think the gentleman will agree with me that my statement was correct.

Mr. HAMILL. Yes; but the remark was injected into the discussion not as an explanatory statement as to who Sullivan was, but in order to give an impression of the character of Sullivan by the character of his client.

Mr. ROGERS. I wanted to give a little local color, and that was absolutely the only reason for the reference.

Mr. HAMILL. Yes; but it is a rule of law that in quoting a statement you should quote the whole statement, and in describing Mr. Sullivan from the character of his client you ought to state all you know about him in connection with that client.

Mr. BRITTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes; but I want to say to the gentleman that I was accorded only 10 minutes, and if he will get me sufficient time to finish I will yield the whole day to him.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that "Bald Jack" Rose was now lecturing with the Secretary of State? [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILL. I, of course, do not know; but, considering the fluency bordering on flippancy of the gentleman, I think he himself would make a splendid collector with Jack Rose. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. This whole controversy hinges on the statement of Walter Vick?

Mr. HAMILL. Absolutely.

Mr. MURDOCK. I read somewhere in the course of this controversy that somebody said that Vick was a "sorehead." What has the gentleman to say on that subject?

Mr. HAMILL. I think if the gentleman will read the newspapers he will find two or three statements to that effect, but I am not characterizing Mr. Vick or anybody else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to yield me some more time.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. HAMILL. Ten minutes.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I have not the time to yield the gentleman all of that. I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman, just one other matter in connection with this case. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] narrated Commissioner Phelan's remarks to the effect that he thought the lord mayoralty consisted mostly in clothes, and that he did not take dinner with that official on that account; but if you had read further in the testimony—and I do not know whether this was in the newspapers and therefore can not object to my friend for not using it—you would have noticed that Mr. Phelan said that the man was so unconscious of the fact that he had committed an offense that on the next evening, I think it was, he took dinner with him, on which occasion he was surrounded with all the pomp and circumstance of his office. I have only this to say. I have no interest in this question one way or the other. I happen to know something about it, and I want to give what little I do know to the gentlemen of the House. This topic is under discussion. I say wait until all of the facts are before us and do not prejudice anybody. I am sure that on second thought my friend, who wants to be just, would not in any way intentionally do a man an injury. I say wait until this committee reports. My friend says that he understands there is nothing more to be taken except the defense of Mr. Sullivan. I understand there is a great deal of testimony to be taken on the very points he raised, namely, as to the acceptability of the minister to the people of the Dominican Republic.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I want to remind the gentleman that my speech was not an attack or intended as an attack on Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan was minister there as a result of the decision of the Secretary of State. My charge and my grievance are against the Secretary of State for his conduct of the Diplomatic Service. I wish the gentleman, before he sits down, would give a little attention to that aspect of the case.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is my province to defend a department which is so well able to take care of itself. Whether the Department of State acted wisely or unwisely will depend on the very thing that the gentleman assumes, as to whether or not these charges that he opens are true. But here is my opinion, if you want it, regarding the "deserving Democrat" letter. Of course, I know that the Republicans are so unquestionably altruistic and so possessed and obsessed with the frantic endeavor to serve the people and the people alone that they would not reward the deserving Republicans. Oh, no! But, outside of that, is it not proper for any department to select for certain positions where the occupant will have it within his power to either injure or assist the administration—is it not good statesmanship, as well as good politics, to select men who are in sympathy with them, and not men who are out of sympathy with them? [Applause on the Democratic side.] The qualifying adjective "deserving" does not necessarily mean anything wrong or sinister. A deserving public man is one who, of course, has rendered party service, but it means deserving in point of ability and attainments as well as in point of political service. You construe the Secre-

tary's letter in a way that suits your own purpose, but it is equally susceptible of a construction such as I have indicated, which would be in favor of and to the credit of the Secretary of State, who wrote the letter. But I am not going to take up the time of the House longer.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I thank you for giving me this opportunity. I merely want to close with one sentence, and say, gentlemen, wait. In the name of American fairness, to which my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] has appealed, let us wait until the entire question is investigated and the facts are before us, and then in the American way let us pronounce a just decision. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], and I would like to inquire how much time I have consumed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARRISON). The gentleman has 44 minutes remaining.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, whoever has traveled abroad and observed the manner in which this Government provides and maintains its diplomatic and consular offices as contrasted with the provision made by other nations must indeed feel ashamed of our neglect. The United States is a competitor for the world's trade, and if we are to secure that trade we must put forth efforts not only equal to those of our competitors, but we must surpass them. If we are to do this, we must establish our country in the confidence and estimation of the people whose trade we seek. We must impart to them some knowledge of the strength and character of the country which seeks their business. In my opinion, nothing will do more to this end than the maintenance of our diplomatic and consular representatives in those lands in a manner and dignity in harmony with this idea. Sound reasoning dictates that this should be our policy, and I welcome every step to this end.

It is for these reasons that I am especially interested in seeing favorable action by the House on those paragraphs on page 23 of this bill making provision for the acquisition of suitable premises or for the purchase of land and the erection thereon of a suitable building or buildings in which to house the consulate general, the United States court, the jail, the post office, and other offices of the United States at Shanghai, China, and for the purchase of a building located upon the land now leased to the consulate general of the United States at Yokohama, Japan, carrying in all appropriations of \$362,275. I favor the appropriation in these two cases because I am aware of their merits. On broader grounds, and for similar reasons, I believe in the policy of Government-owned diplomatic and consular buildings.

COMMERCIAL IMPORTANCE OF SHANGHAI.

Shanghai is a city of nearly a million inhabitants, located on the Whangpoo River, a short distance from the coast. This river and its connecting waters is to China what the Amazon is to South America and the Mississippi is to the United States. Shanghai is at the same time the New York and New Orleans of China—the great financial and commercial center at the mouth of the principal watercourse, over which trade can be carried to one-third of the entire Empire, and the chief city of the great Yangtse Valley. The principal foreign banking houses, steamship offices, business houses, and foreign consulates of China are in Shanghai. Politically Shanghai is second only to Peking in importance; commercially it is by far the most important port of China and the Far East.

Nearly 42 per cent of the total trade of China goes through Shanghai. Her imports for 1913 amounted to over \$178,000,000 and her exports to over \$129,000,000. The volume of combined business passing through that port was therefore something over \$307,000,000.

REASONS FOR A GOVERNMENT-OWNED CONSULATE.

The prestige that comes from external appearances is more marked in China than perhaps in any country in the world, and has a direct bearing on commercial success. The territory set aside for foreign habitation is quite limited. The number of available foreign buildings suitable for consular purposes is small, and Chinese buildings are in no way suitable. It is not easy, therefore, to obtain quarters large and convenient to commercial and shipping houses. All the principal foreign nations, especially the rivals of the United States for the trade of China, own dignified and often pretentious consular buildings. The United States is the only great Nation which does not own its consular and court buildings in Shanghai, the greatest port in China, notwithstanding that it has adopted the policy of acquiring Government-owned consulates.

The impression of power and size, so necessary to be created on the oriental mind, is of primal importance, for he often

judges the strength, worth, and dignity of a nation by the residence of its representative. This fact is what Germany knows and appreciates, and it was with this view that she has built so extensively and grandly in the Orient. In view of the nation to which they belong and of our own increasing trade interests in this land of wonderful possibilities now opening to foreign trade exploitation, all true Americans would be ashamed to see our Nation go back to the undignified, inconvenient, and inadequate consular quarters formerly furnished by the American Government at Shanghai, while the representatives of other powers are so well provided for.

VALUE OF CHINA'S TRADE.

If you pause for a moment to consider that the Republic of China contains something over 400,000,000 of people; that in 1913 she imported nearly \$428,000,000 worth of goods, and exported something over \$306,000,000 worth; if you bear in mind that the relations existing between the Chinese Government and the Chinese people, and the Government of the United States and the people of the United States, are exceedingly friendly and cordial; that our Republic is regarded as the sincere and traditional friend of China, you will appreciate that with greater energy and initiative upon our part, with a more studious effort applied to capturing the Chinese trade, we could have increased our imports to that country greatly beyond the figure they reached.

Now, if we are to canvass the Orient in quest of our share of its lucrative commerce we must expect to proceed along those lines which have been determined the correct lines to travel. We can not expect to do business contrary to what others have found to be the best business policy and succeed. We certainly can not hope to build up respect for our Government and confidence in our commercial houses unless we appear before these people, who do not know us, in a way to win their respect and confidence. You know, and I know, that with many people appearances go a long way. It should not excite wonder that in the absence of a definite knowledge of you people should judge you by your appearance. It is therefore not surprising that in the absence of more adequate information the people of China and other foreign countries should judge us by the only evidence of our character they have daily before their eyes.

CHARACTER OF OUR REPRESENTATION.

And what evidence have they? Merchant ships flying our flag rarely enter a foreign port. Indeed, the Stars and Stripes are a curiosity in the Orient, unless they be seen on a man-of-war or some other Government-owned vessel stationed in Asiatic waters. And if these people fail to behold any evidence of our Republic manifested in the form of flags on vessels in their harbors, what other tokens have they by which to judge as to the kind and character of nation we are?

Other nations possess the buildings which their diplomatic and consular representatives occupy, maintain them in good condition, and thus create an impression of dignity, stability, and affluence. But the American diplomatic representative and consular officer must hold forth in some rented and temporarily converted private dwelling whose appearance and location make but a poor comparison beside the headquarters of those nations who are our trade competitors.

Is it any wonder, I ask, in the face of such evidence, the Chinaman, or resident of whatever country he may be, should misjudge our character? Surely, if other Governments find it a paying investment to provide befitting headquarters for their diplomatic and consular officers, we should find it equally as profitable to do likewise.

MARYLAND'S INTEREST.

I wish to make plain, Mr. Chairman, that Maryland is deeply interested in this subject. Representing, as I do, a State which has been one of the great commercial States of the Union, a State which embraces the most magnificent bay of the Nation, a bay which is ever alive with ships of commerce, it is but natural that those things which influence or affect our commerce should be of paramount importance to us.

I do not believe that interest in the merits of this subject is confined to those Representatives from our seaboard States; but I can readily understand why Representatives from our seaboard States should be more deeply interested than those hailing from the interior of our country. My people understand, as those of other nations have already learned, that those things which contribute to the increase of commerce are worthy of careful study and consideration. We know full well if other nations have found it to their financial interest to maintain their own buildings in foreign countries in which to house their diplomatic and consular representatives they have come to that conclusion after careful study of the subject, and if they have reached that conclusion, we believe that equal consideration

upon our part would show that it would be a profitable thing for us to follow their example.

The people of Maryland have, to a large extent, always been especially interested in our country's commerce. Since the establishment of our Government Maryland has been a ship-building and ship-sailing State. Maryland sailors and seamen have always been a part of the crews of our men-of-war, and there is hardly a naval battle written in our country's history but what Marylanders took a prominent part.

For these reasons our interest is a natural one. We believe in helping those merchants who carry American goods to foreign shores. We realize that a merchant marine is indispensable, and we appreciate that in the contest for this foreign trade our merchants should have all the assistance and prestige that can be rendered them by our diplomatic and consular officers so situated in foreign lands as to make them influential with the people among whom they are domiciled. We realize that our consular and diplomatic officers can not attain the sphere of influence and usefulness they ought to occupy unless they enjoy a creditable standing among the people of those lands to which they are assigned. We believe that such a standing would be a material aid to us commercially, and for these reasons Maryland is keenly interested in the measure now before the House.

OUR FOREIGN TRADE.

That you may have some adequate conception of the extent of our interest, I wish to point out that in 1914 more than 732 vessels engaged in foreign commerce entered the port of Baltimore, in addition to 1,483 engaged in coastwise commerce. During this same period 826 vessels cleared from the port of Baltimore engaged in foreign commerce, and 1,833 vessels engaged in coastwise traffic.

Our exports in 1914 amounted to \$106,852,045 and our imports were \$29,687,729. Our total foreign trade was estimated at something in the neighborhood of \$136,330,774. It is not remarkable, as you will observe, in view of this vast volume of foreign commerce, that this subject should be one which appeals directly and personally to my district.

We have always been large exporters to foreign countries, as well as importers from those countries. We have always been close to the elbow of competition, and being this close, we have learned what every man learns who engages in a formidable struggle with a competitor who is alive to his opportunities.

We have been taught that when men invest money along certain lines, even though those lines may appear unimportant and without value, it will generally be found upon closer examination that they are productive of good, and if they were not they would not be followed. We have learned that it pays to keep abreast of your competitor. Surpass him if you can, but if you can not surpass him, do not let him surpass you; do not fall behind and get in the vanguard. Now, our consular officers are our trade representatives. If we fail to give them the proper respectability through housing them under appropriate conditions, the people in foreign lands will not only look down upon them but they will look down upon us.

SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE.

The opening of the Panama Canal and the development of our merchant marine will naturally bring us in closer trade relations with many of the countries and people of South America. Our South American friends, with whom we will be endeavoring to do a greater business in the future, are an impressionable race. There can be no denying the fact that our failure to maintain in many of these countries consulates of a class and character favorably comparing with those of other foreign Governments has resulted in a comparison decidedly to our disadvantage and has exerted its influence upon our trade with those countries.

I am firmly of the opinion that, with the inauguration of a policy whereby our consular representatives will be housed in a style befitting their position as representatives of the great North American Republic, such a change will create a better opinion of us and a more favorable attitude toward the business interests of this country.

As between two merchants, one exhibiting every evidence of stability and the other minus those evidences, you would not hesitate a moment in placing your trade. It would go to the one in whom your confidence was the greater. On a larger scale, this is our situation in South America. We are the natural market for supplying many of their demands as well as the chief consumers of much of their raw materials; yet so lamentably have we failed in making the most of our opportunities that European countries have actually beaten us out of these markets at our very door. As an evidence of this, less than two years ago Dr. Lauro S. Muller, the Brazilian minister of foreign affairs, during a visit to this country pointed out that

In 1913 our imports from Brazil amounted to nearly \$124,000,000, while our exports to that country reached only a little over \$34,000,000.

Now that we are awake to the necessity of an American-owned merchant marine and are to have vessels of our own, we should take another step forward and see that every legitimate and proper assistance that can be extended our trade getters in those countries be offered; and the best way to extend this assistance is through making apparent to the people of those countries whose trade we are seeking that they are trading with a first-class business country, and let the surroundings of our representatives bear evidence of that stability with which we would impress them.

A SOUND POLICY.

Permit me to direct the attention of the House to the fact that the ownership by this country of our diplomatic and consular headquarters abroad is not only a wise investment, when considered with reference to its influence in favor of our country, but that, judged purely from the standpoint of a business investment of the Government, it is a policy economically sound.

We can acquire the necessary property, build our embassies and consulates, and maintain them for a sum much less than we now pay in rent. I have heard it said by some men that they could rent a house at a sum less than the interest charged on the money required to purchase it, but I have never known of an instance where the Government could rent a building equally adequate and suitable for its needs for diplomatic or consular headquarters at a price anywhere near that for which the building could be built and maintained by our Government.

The average private building which can be secured by our Government for the use of its consular offices is, as a rule, unsuited to our particular needs. I understand that it is frequently the case that when the proper building can be secured it is unsuited for our use by reason of its location; then where the proper location is decided upon a suitable building is almost impossible to be obtained. The result is obviously a makeshift. Where our consulate is in the proper building it is generally to be found not in the right location.

It is apparent, therefore, that the only solution of the problem is Government-owned consulates, erected on Government-owned ground, permanently maintained by our Government for its use, as other Governments are already doing.

OUR CONSULAR EMPLOYEES.

I am acquainted to some extent with the character of men in our Consular Service and with the nature of the work they are doing. Of these men I can speak only in the highest terms. They are a splendid body of men, thoroughly qualified, competent, and efficient, and doing a valuable work. Probably no other Government in the world is securing more valuable services from its consular employees than those services which are being rendered our Government by the men in its service. Year after year their field of activity is being expanded and the value of their services becoming greater. Men of this character rendering services of such importance should certainly be adequately provided for by the Government they represent. Because of its good work in behalf of American trade and its aid to business men in the United States our Consular Service holds a warm spot in the heart of our business interests, and I am sure that these interests will emphatically approve of any measure the purpose of which is to give our Consular Service a better standing abroad than it now enjoys, and thus to increase its usefulness.

COMPENSATION OF DIPLOMATIC OFFICERS.

And while the opportunity is afforded I want to refer to one deplorable feature of our Diplomatic Service, namely, the neglect of our Government to bear the rental expenses of all our embassy buildings and our failure to pay our diplomatic representatives salaries commensurate with the positions they hold.

It is true that provision has been made for an embassy in Mexico City and that the President recently asked for the purchase of premises for diplomatic headquarters at Habana, Cuba. We now own our headquarters, at Peking, China; Tokyo, Japan; and Bangkok, Siam, and an appropriation was recently authorized for a new building at Tokyo. These were acquired under the act of Congress of February 17, 1911, providing for the purchase and erection of embassy, legation, and consular buildings abroad. If we continue along this line, of course we shall eventually possess adequate buildings in every foreign country where we will be warranted in constructing them; and we certainly need them.

In a number of countries the salaries received by our chief diplomatic officers, I am told, is hardly sufficient to discharge the rent of their official places of residence. These countries therefore can not be represented by other than men of wealth

who can afford to work for the Government without any compensation whatever. But that is not the worst of it; for the usual expenses of entertaining, I am informed, amount to far in excess of the rental costs of suitable quarters for an embassy, with the result that our diplomatic officers must not only suffer the loss of salary, but contribute a substantial sum for the privilege of representing our Government in those countries in which these conditions obtain. As a result, the occupancy of these posts is necessarily confined to men of financial resources with the willingness to pay for what the Government itself should pay. Obviously our Diplomatic Service must have suffered. I make this statement with no reflection upon the men now in the service, or who have been engaged in it in the past, but merely upon the hypothesis that any condition which narrows the number of possible appointees to such posts to those enjoying incomes from private sources must necessarily exclude some men of real ability, precluded from serving by reason of their lack of the necessary financial means.

Our traditional attitude is one of deep-seated aversion to inequality of opportunity. Yet in this situation we find the most flagrant violation of this principle, and one which must necessarily operate to deprive our Diplomatic Service of some of the best men, and thereby prevent that service becoming, as it should be, the embodiment of the greatest skill, experience, and efficiency.

CONCLUSION.

Many reforms in our Diplomatic and Consular Service have been brought about recently. We need the very best men we can secure in the foreign service of this country. We require men of genuine talent and ability, and when we have secured such men, and they have satisfactorily demonstrated their worth, they ought to be rewarded and spurred on to even more valuable efforts. These places ought to be open to all classes of our people possessing the necessary training and qualifications. Under the present arrangement relating to apportionment among the States and the restrictions with which these places are surrounded, through no fault of the officers of our State Department, these appointments do not always go to those possessing the best qualifications for them.

Upon the conclusion of the European war the nations of the earth will enter upon a broader and wider field in their relations. The great victories of the future, I believe, will be those achieved in the battles of diplomacy rather than through the clash of arms. Against that day we must now begin to prepare, unless we would linger in comparative diplomatic and commercial isolation. We must begin the education and training of the best men procurable as representatives capable of looking after our country in all those involved conditions of closer relationship, for it will be through the efforts of men of this character that we shall assume our heritage as a leader in the commercial and political affairs of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin to use some time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, as I calculate now, I have 39 minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the position of this Republic in the family of nations makes it important that we should not be indifferent to the good opinion of mankind touching our foreign policy.

In the time I have I want to refer to the foreign policy of the United States, if it has a foreign policy, and suggest what I regard as an important improvement. It is doubtful if the United States has a foreign policy to-day. Let me illustrate: In the closing days of the last administration a delicate situation arose in a neighboring Republic. The retiring President gave as a reason why he thought it would indicate for him to take any action at that time that the action taken might not be in keeping with the policy of the incoming administration. My contention, Mr. Chairman, is that the foreign policy of the United States should not change with the fortunes of political parties in political campaigns. No other great nation changes its foreign policy as a result of change in political parties. The foreign policy of the United States should be a consistent, continuing policy, maintained by a foreign office that does not change in its personnel below the head of the office with the fortunes of political parties.

I am not criticizing this administration more than any other. I am simply saying that from the foundation of the Republic to the present hour the foreign policy of the country, if it has one, has changed with the political parties as they have changed as a result of a political campaign by political parties and ad-

ministrations rewarding with foreign appointments and responsible positions in the State Department those who have rendered conspicuous political service or given large campaign contributions. This is not the policy of any other nation on earth, and should not be the practice in this. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], who has just addressed the House, has spoken of the necessity of this Nation having the respect of mankind and of the people with whom we have international relations. But how can foreign nations with a consistent foreign policy, that have foreign offices with men trained in the foreign service, who carry out the policy of their country, have respect for a great nation that gives as a reward to political campaigners or those who have given contributions the office of ambassador or minister to the great countries of the world, and too often without any regard whatever as to their fitness for work in statecraft and diplomacy, as we have just been shown by the case of Santo Domingo.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the fact that our Government is a Government of parties, so-called, what remedy has the gentleman from Kansas to suggest for this condition which he describes?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Simple enough. I would make all officers below the Secretary of State continuing officers. I would not change the Assistant Secretary of State, I would not change the Counselor for the State Department, and I would have officers who are familiar with the precedents and with international law and usage, and also familiar with the details of the office and able to carry out a consecutive foreign policy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not a fact that, regardless of parties and administrations in the past, with very few exceptions, and small exceptions, too, our representatives abroad have reflected credit upon our country and distinction upon themselves in the discharge of their duties?

Mr. CAMPBELL. In the main, that is true; we were hopelessly weak in our Consular Service until the last 15 years, when we established the merit system in that service.

Mr. BARKLEY rose.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I can not yield further. Until 15 years ago our Consular Service was worse than weak. Since that time we have made the Consular Service a continuing service, and men appointed and promoted in that service now are not appointed or promoted because of their political affiliations or services in political campaigns, but it is different in our foreign service. Our ministers and ambassadors are far more important to the welfare and the peace of our country in the family of nations.

Mr. CLINE. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Make it very brief.

Mr. CLINE. I want to inquire whether you think the retention of the Secretary would not change the policy of the Government; in other words, the undersecretaries would not control the policy of the Government?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Secretary would rely upon the office. I would make it the policy of the Government of the United States to ignore partisanship in the matter of the foreign policy. [Applause.] For instance, we should have had a foreign policy that would have enabled President Taft to have dealt with the conditions in Mexico in the closing days of his administration that would not have been changed and would not have invited a change by the incoming administration within a few days. The same thing is true of what has been done in Colombia. The policy of one administration with that country has been changed as a result of a change of political parties. We should be above and independent of the influence of foreign nations in our domestic politics. No nation on earth except our own should have any concern as to which political party should be successful in a campaign in the United States. And now that we have become great in the family of nations and our relations are becoming more and more important, naturally foreign nations will participate in our political campaigns and have an interest in them if our foreign policy is to be changed every time political parties change in this country.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I agree absolutely with the attitude of the gentleman from Kansas, but I want to ask him this question: Has he ever tried to obtain legislation to bring about the condition which he describes?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The thought I am giving this House has just suggested itself to me within a few days.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the gentleman how he would proceed to fill vacancies?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Just as they are filled in the Consular Service—by promotions and from an eligible list.

Mr. McKENZIE. By civil service?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; I would make it so that men would have an opportunity in our foreign service to prepare for the foreign service as a career, just as they prepare for our military service, as they prepare for service in the Navy, and I would advance them as they show a fitness for advancement, and I would have houses and equipment, so that men of modern circumstances could go to the Court of St. James, to Paris, to Berlin, and to all the great courts of the world without having a private fortune or the necessity of a private fortune. These are the suggestions that I arose to make while this bill was under consideration. And I think it important not only to the welfare but to the dignity of our country that we cease to appoint men to responsible positions in the State Department and as ambassadors and ministers to reward them for campaign services or campaign contributions. We can no longer be indifferent to the opinions that other nations have of us. There is no question that the nice things the Secretary of State has said to South American Republics are all overturned by what he has done in Santo Domingo. Nations take note of these things, and gauge us and our foreign policy and our lack of foreign policy by what we do. So I urge that the Committee on Foreign Affairs take up the question of a foreign office. I do not know that I would include ambassadors in the classified foreign service at the present time, but ultimately I would include the ambassadors, or as soon as suitable provision can be made in foreign countries for housing them.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has just said, and there is much force and merit in his views upon the question of a fixed foreign policy in so far as the same may be practicable. I invite his attention to this, that under all conditions, changing as they are from time to time, a fixed policy always would be impracticable and impossible. He refers to two instances. He refers to the case of Colombia, and I infer from what he says that we ought to abide by the rape of that helpless nation and not undertake to make amends for the injustice which all the world recognizes as such. He lamented the fact that President Taft did not decide upon a fixed Mexican policy. I regret that he did not, for if he had done so I have no doubt that President Wilson would have carried that policy out. But this administration had to originate a policy with reference to the Mexican situation. It has been a successful one, and to-day the American people applaud President Wilson's course with relation to Mexican affairs. [Applause.] One thing which I regret more than another is that in times such as these, when the world is involved in war, the Members of this House can not sometimes get serious and forget partisan bias and give credit where credit belongs. To-day, and on every day, criticisms come from that side of the House—fault-finding and carping for political purposes and for political effect. And yet no man here volunteers a suggestion as to how conditions can be remedied or what policies would be better.

I am not the spokesman of the administration. I have no brief other than as a Democratic Member of this House to speak for the President or the Department of State. But I sometimes feel like coming to my feet and asking gentlemen to point out what there is in the management of our foreign affairs that could be improved and what changes they would make. I for one believe that Mr. Bryan is performing noble duties for his country, and that his department is being conducted as well as it ever was in the history of our country. With all the troubles that surround us, the complications which arise from day to day, gentlemen can not put their fingers upon a single act of the Department of State and criticize it—not one. They can not point to a single change which ought to be made; and if this administration continues as it has and gets through with the troubles that now involve the world without the United States becoming involved, the present Secretary of State will go into history as one of the greatest that ever exercised the functions of that high office. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the gentleman think that the Santo Domingo incident is above criticism?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not seen anything to seriously criticize in that. I will say that I rather commend or approve the Secretary of State in wishing in a proper way to provide for political friends, because in all that he has done in that direc-

tion he has never recommended or secured the appointment of any man who was not a good, capable, and suitable man for the position.

Now, may I ask gentlemen to grow serious for one moment? Forget that we are partisans, that there is a line here dividing this House, and upon that side sit partisan Republicans and upon this side sit partisan Democrats, and for one moment say to ourselves that we will give credit where credit is due. I will read an extract from a great newspaper, edited by a great editor, and I only wish that gentlemen here could sometimes grow as broad minded as the author of this article. It is entitled "The man of burdens," and is from the Chicago Herald of the 17th, a paper which never was Democratic. It is edited, as I have said, by a broad-minded, liberal man, who can sometimes forget partisan bias and pay tribute to one to whom tribute is due.

I read:

THE MAN OF BURDENS.

In these troubled times, when every day shows more clearly the dangers that confront even the most sincere neutrality, the hearts of all Americans should go out in sympathy and support to that solitary man sitting in the White House at Washington who carries the welfare of 100,000,000 people so largely in his hand.

His is a staggering responsibility. It is the greatest that could be laid on the chief executive of any nation in time of peace. No American since Lincoln has borne such a burden, has been confronted with issues which are so big with fate for the land we love.

It is easy for those who do not share his burden or realize its tremendous weight on heart and mind to say what ought to be done under any and all circumstances. But his is the solemn duty not only of saying, but also of acting; not only of acting but also of doing so with the knowledge that the welfare of his fellow citizens may hang upon his course.

Under such circumstances President Wilson needs the sympathy and support of every true American. He needs to know that political friends and foes alike are with him; that they know the burden he is carrying and believe that he will carry it—if with pain and labor to himself—with honor to the Nation.

He should be made to feel that there is from one end of the country to another an abiding faith in his integrity and singleness of purpose and in his absolute determination to walk with circumspection but directly to the goal, stepping aside neither in the spirit of truculence nor subservience.

He should be made to feel that partisanship and personal feeling wholly cease to have a meaning for Americans when their President is confronted with what may quickly develop into an international crisis of grave significance; that the whole moral force and the whole heart and the whole mind of the Nation are his to lean upon or to call upon for support.

And above all he should be made to feel that Americans understand how free from the taint of personal ambition and pride are his high-minded efforts to serve his country in these moments of its need for wise guidance; that it is of his country and not of himself he thinks first and last of all; that his one aim is to serve her and her alone.

Nothing that could be said or felt or done can avail to abate his high and solemn responsibility. But his way may and should be brightened by the knowledge that those for whom he stands and speaks and labors have confidence in his integrity, his ability, his singleness of purpose, and his zeal.

[Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me I shall not discuss foreign affairs, but will bring to your attention some domestic affairs.

Lately we have heard much said here about the number of people in this country who are out of work. I am pleased to be able to inform the House that business conditions in the State which I have the honor to represent have been improving recently, and are still improving, notwithstanding the disturbance of business caused by the European war. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Some of the new business is shown by the newspaper articles which I will read.

The Evening Journal, of Wilmington, Del., of December 5, 1914, contains the following article:

HARLAN & HOLLINGSWORTH TO BUILD BIG FOREIGN STEAMER—LOCAL CORPORATION GETS CONTRACT FOR FREIGHT CARRIER 450 FEET IN LENGTH—ONE OF LARGEST EVER BUILT IN LOCAL YARD.

Announcement was made by the Harlan & Hollingsworth Corporation to-day that it had just signed a contract for a large steamship.

The vessel will be 450 feet long, and one of the largest, if not the largest, ever constructed in Wilmington.

It will be a freight steamship, and is to be constructed pursuant to an order received from a foreign country.

Just for whom the steamship will be built is not announced. The Harlan & Hollingsworth officials stated that work has been started on preliminary details, but actual construction may not be started for a month.

The Wilmington Morning News, of Wilmington, Del., of February 16, 1915, contains the following article:

HARLAN & HOLLINGSWORTH CORPORATION GETS ANOTHER CONTRACT—LONDON PETROLEUM CONCERN DUPLICATES ORDER FOR SHIPS.

The Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Co., of London, England, that recently placed an order for the construction of a freight steamer 450 feet long with the Harlan & Hollingsworth Corporation, has duplicated the order. It was said yesterday, and where the company was to build one ship it will now build two.

The Wilmington Morning News, of Wilmington, Del., issued to-day, contains the following article:

HARLAN & HOLLINGSWORTH CORPORATION GETS ANOTHER CONTRACT—TO BUILD FERRYBOAT AND STEEL PASSENGER COACHES.

Information was given out at the offices of the Harlan & Hollingsworth Corporation yesterday that they have succeeded in securing a contract for the building of the hull of a large steel ferryboat for the Fort Lee Ferry Co., of New York. The vessel will be 200 feet in length and 61 feet in breadth of beam. It is to have a carrying capacity of 1,200 persons, and will be fitted with all the latest modern accommodations, together with a strictly fireproof equipment, conforming to all rules regulating safety required at sea. She will be used for traffic between Riverside, N. Y., and Edge Water Park, N. J.

Announcement was also made of the contract secured from the Philadelphia & Reading Railroad for the construction of 10 all-steel coaches. The cars will be 70 feet in length, and they will be completed as soon as possible.

These two contracts, coupled with the contract for the two large tank steamers which are to be built for the Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Co., of London, England, and several minor contracts, will mean a revival of old-time activity at the plant. It is thought by the opening of spring the concern will be working on full time, with their full quota of men. It was learned that the keel of the first tanker had been already laid and that preparations for the second one are now going on, the material arriving yesterday.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware has expired.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] that he has 24 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the remarks of the gentleman who has just left the floor [Mr. BROCKSON] with a great deal of interest. The news that he has read has suggested to my mind a few queries.

First, I have wondered whether this was a "psychological" recovery from a "psychological depression." I have been wondering if we have had no bad times, as our friends on the other side have been claiming for the past year, how it happens that they were improving.

But the one question that suggested itself most pointedly to my mind was this: It seems that this shipyard referred to by the gentleman from Delaware is now constructing foreign ships for the foreign trade, for the freight trade; the very character of vessels that are proposed to be purchased under the terms of the bill that we passed the other day.

Now, if the foreigner can come into our shipyards and have his vessels constructed, where is the necessity of our giving authority to a shipping board to go forth and purchase foreign ships? If the foreigners have ships for sale, why are they here in our yards ordering vessels to be constructed? What becomes of the argument that we have been hearing, that we must have the privilege of going out and purchasing foreign ships to get them under the American flag?

I could not help thinking, when the gentleman from Delaware was telling about the conditions that had been improved, of the argument that we have so frequently heard to the effect that the European war has brought upon the country the great business depression that we are now suffering from. The revival of which the gentleman speaks is mostly due to foreign orders. It seems that the war has acted to a certain extent as a protective tariff. It has caused the foreigner to sell us less and to buy of us more. It is giving some work to our own people. I hope when the gentleman gives us a statement the next time about prosperity he will show us something that is being revived in our domestic industries not due to the war.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Delaware?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have only three minutes.

Mr. BROCKSON. Well, I know; but I want to correct the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman can correct it in a minute, all right.

Mr. BROCKSON. Only two boats are to be used in the foreign trade. The other boat is to be used in New York, and the cars are intended for domestic trade entirely.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I understood the gentleman to say that some of the cars were for the foreign trade.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] to use some of his time. We will probably have but one speech on this side.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman says "probably." Will you or will you not have but one speech on your side? It ought not to be difficult to determine that.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am not positive.

Mr. COOPER. I will ask the gentleman why not? Why can not the gentleman determine?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Because I have not made up my mind. It is a question between two gentlemen, as to whether one shall have all the time or divide it between the two.

The CHAIRMAN. Do the gentlemen want all the time to be taken out of their time equally?

Mr. COOPER. This is not debate. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in view of some recent events, I want to discuss in the time allotted to me the question of the relations between the President and Congress.

Under the Constitution the President has the right to recommend to Congress such measures as he deems proper, and he also has the right to veto any measure that may be passed by Congress that he deems unwise, and in both of these rights he can not and ought not to be interfered with. In other words, the President has the right to recommend any legislation that he may desire, and he may also veto any bill that may be passed by the Congress and without assigning any reason for his action.

I do not believe, however, that the Constitution contemplated that the President should have the right to influence the legislative body to the extent that on many occasions Executive influence has been exercised, and we have very recently had an illustration of such influence both with relation to the passage of a bill and also with relation to a veto message that, in my opinion, violates the spirit of the Constitution, and if the tendency that has gradually been growing up in the last few years for the President to dictate, if not dominate, the Congress is not discontinued the time will soon come when one of the great political parties of this country will declare against what will be termed "Executive interference," and the people will indorse the party that makes such a declaration.

Within a very few days the present Congress passed the immigration bill. It was sent to the President, and after considering it for a number of days, in his wisdom, using his discretion and the power given him by the Constitution, he saw fit to veto the bill, and he had a right to veto it if it did not meet with his approval. There, in my judgment, his responsibility in relation to the measure ceased. The bill had passed the House by a vote of 252 to 126, or by a vote of 2 to 1. It went to the Senate. It passed that body by a vote of 50 to 7. The bill then went to conference, and when the conference report was adopted in the House the vote was 227 to 94. So it appears beyond any question that a two-thirds majority of the House and a 7 to 1 majority of the other body was in favor of the legislation.

Notwithstanding the vote in the House upon the bill and the conference report, when the vote was taken upon the passage of the bill over the veto of the President it failed to receive the necessary two-thirds majority, due to the change of several Members on that side of the Chamber who voted to sustain the veto when only a few days before they were recorded for the passage of the measure.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe anyone will deny that except for the influence of the Executive the bill would have passed this House, the veto of the President to the contrary notwithstanding. I do not believe there is anyone on either side of the House who will assert that in his opinion the veto would have been sustained had it not been for the influence of the administration.

In vetoing the immigration bill the President in his message said:

Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates. But candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibilities so clearly imposed upon me by the Constitution in matters of legislation leave me no choice but to dissent.

This was a sufficient statement to explain why he could not approve the measure, and it would seem as if a Member of Congress ought to be permitted to vote his conviction upon any question when convinced that "candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibilities so clearly imposed * * * by the Constitution" impel him to do so.

He ought to be left to discharge his obligation without such influence from the Executive as might be exercised, in view of the great power that the President possesses, and he ought not to be criticized if his position is not in accord with the opinion of the President.

I want to refer to the shipping bill that was passed by the House the other day. The President, in his message delivered in this Chamber at a joint session of the Senate and House on the 8th day of December, in accordance with his power under the Constitution, urged the Congress to enact into law the then pending shipping bill. That was entirely within the functions of his high office. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the President ought not to take any interest in measures that he may recommend to Congress, because that would be going further than I wish to go. But I do say that the Executive ought not to use the power that he has, as it was used on this shipping bill and with relation to the veto of the immigration bill, and that such use is a violation of the power conferred by the Constitution upon the President with relation to legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the shipping bill that we passed on Tuesday was not the pending bill that the President referred to in his message on December 8. It was a bill originating outside of the House, prepared and brought here, but not introduced. It came into the House under a special rule reported by the Committee on Rules, making it in order as an amendment to a bill that had passed the Senate and was pending before the Committee on Naval Affairs, and which had not had any consideration by that committee; the rule discharged the Committee on Naval Affairs from the consideration of the bill and directed that it be reported to the House with the shipping bill added to it as an amendment, though the amendment was not germane to the Senate bill. The rule provided that after six hours of general debate the previous question should be ordered and the bill placed upon its passage without being read, so that its different provisions could be discussed under the usual five-minute rule, and without any opportunity to offer amendments, and under that gag rule it was jammed through the House. This action is another evidence of Democratic inconsistency, because for a number of years before they got control of this House they were protesting against gag rule, and made it an issue in the campaigns. I wonder what some of them will say to their constituents if they are questioned with reference to their action in voting, as most of them did, for the rule that was adopted in connection with the ship-purchase bill. I might remind them that in their platform of 1908 they declared that under the Republican Party the House of Representatives "has ceased to be a deliberative body." In their platform of 1912, boasting of what their party had accomplished, they said:

It has, among other achievements, revised the rules of the House of Representatives so as to give to the representatives of the American people freedom of speech and action in advocating, proposing, and perfecting remedial legislation.

The adoption of the rule on the ship-purchase bill is only following many other gag rules that have been adopted by this and the preceding Congress that in their drastic provisions exceed by far anything that the Republicans were ever accused of.

Mr. Chairman, no one now will dispute that the ship-purchase bill is the President's bill. It was admitted in the debate, in speech, and in verse; it was stated by the distinguished Speaker of the House in a caucus of his party during the late hours of the night immediately preceding the day when the bill was passed, if we can believe what we read in the newspapers, that it was the bill of the President; that it was the President's desire that the bill be passed; in fact, that he was insisting upon its passage, notwithstanding that a clear majority of the Members of this body, if they had voted their honest convictions, were against it; it was jammed, as I have already stated, through the House.

And how was it done, Mr. Chairman? To a large extent it was done in the same manner that the veto message on the immigration bill was sustained when it was considered by the House. A representative of the administration, one of his immediate official family, and the same one in both instances, appeared at the Capitol and was very much in evidence lobbying with the Democratic Members of the House, urging them to support the wishes of the President. And why was that particular member of the Cabinet—the Postmaster General—selected to lobby with the Members in both of these cases? It is perfectly apparent why he was selected. It was because he happens to have the ear of corn. [Laughter on the Republican side.] In other words, the Democratic Members saw post-office appointments in their different districts dangling before them, and they evidently believed that if they wished to have their way

with relation to these appointments it would probably be policy on their part to do the will of the administration.

We have heard a good deal since this administration came into power about lobbying and lobbyists, but there is no influence upon legislation that is more pernicious than a Cabinet official who has much patronage to dispense using his influence with the Members of Congress upon pending measures. That this has been done by the present Postmaster General both as to the veto of the President on the immigration bill and with reference to the ship-purchase bill can not be denied.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the morning after the caucus, and the day on which the shipping bill was considered, it was currently reported that the Postmaster General had communicated with somebody in the House, wanting a list of the names of the members of the Democratic Party who had stated that they would not abide by the action of the caucus of the night before. Now, I do not know whether he made that inquiry or not, but if he did, what was the significance of it? Certainly it could have but one significance, and that would be the effect that it might have upon the Members on that side of the Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had more time to discuss this question. I want to read as a part of my remarks excerpts from two speeches, one by the lamented Abraham Lincoln at Pittsburgh on February 15, 1861, another by Stephen A. Douglas at Alton, Ill., October 15, 1858, which speeches were published upon the editorial page of the New York Sun recently, both dealing with the subject of the President and Congress. I commend the same to the Members of the House.

[From Abraham Lincoln's address at Pittsburgh, Feb. 15, 1861.]

By the Constitution the Executive may recommend measures which he may think proper and he may veto those he thinks improper, and it is supposed that he may add to these certain indirect influences to affect the action of Congress. My political education strongly inclines me against a very free use of any of these means by the Executive to control the legislation of the country. As a rule, I think it better that Congress should originate as well as perfect its measures without external bias.

[From Stephen A. Douglas's opening speech at Alton, Oct. 15, 1858.]

And now this warfare is made on me [by Mr. Buchanan] because I would not surrender my convictions of duty, because I would not abandon my constituency and receive the orders of the Executive authorities how I should vote in the Senate of the United States. I hold that an attempt to control the Senate on the part of the Executive is subversive of the Constitution. The executive department is independent of the Senate and the Senate is independent of the Executive. * * * Whenever you recognize the right of the Executive to say to a Senator, "Do this or I will take off the heads of your friends," you convert this Government from a Republic into a despotism. Whenever you recognize the right of a President to say to a Member of Congress, "Vote as I tell you or I will bring a power to bear against you that will crush you," you destroy the independence of the Representative and convert him into a tool of Executive power.

Mr. Chairman, I am an optimist. I am always looking for the good that there is in everything. I have seen some good come out of this outrageous, high-handed proceeding that took place here two or three days ago in connection with the shipping bill. It is reported by the newspapers that the distinguished Speaker in the Democratic caucus the night before the bill was passed made the statement that a special session of Congress meant disaster and defeat to the Democratic Party. Here is what the Speaker is alleged to have said:

The House should do everything possible to expedite action and avoid an extra session. If there is an extra session, the Democratic Party will be wiped off the face of the earth at the next election.

At that time it looked as if a special session was inevitable, but we now understand that it is not being considered and that there is no intention of any special session of the Sixty-fourth Congress. So that much good has come out of the passage by the House of the ship-purchase bill, and the Speaker, who went so far as to help the administration out of a bad situation by aiding in getting his party associates to vote for the bill, has indeed rendered to the country a most valuable service if his prophecy of the effect of a special session has resulted in abandoning that idea. Another good that came out of the passage of the shipping bill was that it afforded a question upon which the Republican Members of the House for the first time during this Congress were able to vote as a unit, and it was extremely gratifying to me, as I am about to retire to private life, that at last the Republicans are united and that they had the support of a majority of the Progressive Members of the House, which, Mr. Chairman, assures in 1916 Republican success and a return to the prosperity that will come to the country as it has on every other occasion when that party is in control of the affairs of the Nation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. GUERNSEY] was to occupy some time, but inasmuch as he is not here I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. GUERNSEY] have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON] gave some figures about the improvement of the industries on the Atlantic coast. Since that time I have felt in my pocket, and have found there some figures that show the conditions on the Pacific.

A few days ago the House of Representatives of the State of Washington passed a resolution, by a vote of 74 to 20, asking the repeal of the Underwood tariff law. They gave some figures to show some of the reasons why. I quote from the resolution figures giving the increases in imports into the State of Washington for the year 1914:

The importation of butter increased from 12,008 to 1,104,000 pounds; eggs from 4,755 to 289,000 dozen; fresh beef from 145,891 to 3,453,000 pounds; hogs from 5 head to 98,000; salmon from 759,362 to 3,000,000; lumber from 434,000 to 12,026,000 feet; shingles from 44,276,000 to 235,000,000.

All that represents that much work and wages that have been taken from the laborer in Washington and given to the foreigner. Not a single one of the articles is selling for a cent less than when the Underwood tariff bill went into effect.

Last night I had the pleasure of attending a banquet in New York, given by the American Pulp and Paper Association, and the facts developed there that there is not a single newspaper on Puget Sound that is using a pound of paper manufactured in the United States. Before the Underwood tariff law went into effect every pound of paper used there was manufactured in the State of Washington. The paper then used represented a pay roll of \$150,000 a month, and every cent of that has been transferred from the State of Washington to British Columbia. The Underwood tariff law has destroyed the pulp business of Puget Sound as completely as a conflagration. But the people pay the same for the newspapers that they paid before. That is some of the prosperity that we are suffering under on Puget Sound as the result of the Underwood tariff law, and we do not believe that it is psychological or entirely a state of mind. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I have here in my hand another matter, an order issued by the Postmaster General, reducing the salary of letter collectors \$200 a year. What is the reason for that? What is the use of reducing the wages throughout the country in this time of the return of prosperity. Also in his report he requests that the eight-hour law be repealed in order that these letter carriers can do more work. That does not look like a period of general prosperity. Is that the reason that we have the general reduction of hours and wages? Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I understand that I have three minutes left.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TAGGART].

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, it was my purpose to make a few observations on our foreign relations, but on account of the shortness of time I am unable to address myself properly to that subject.

I am very much interested in the fact that the State Legislature of Washington took occasion to pass a resolution with reference to the repeal of the Underwood tariff law. I have no doubt but that there are many phases of the law that may not be to the best interests of all the people of the State of Washington. But I will take this occasion to call attention to another resolution that was passed by a Republican house of representatives in the State of Kansas. Kansas Republicans are nothing if not eloquent. The house of representatives of Kansas consists of a large majority of Republicans—66 Republicans against 49 Democrats, 9 Progressives, and 1 Socialist, constituting the 125 members of the lower house of the most prosperous State in the Union. This is what they said:

House resolution No. 33.

Whereas the Old World is now a theater of war and blood, more appalling than any picture to be found in all the past history of the civilization; and
Whereas the United States forms a striking contrast to these warring nations, being a land of happiness, prosperity, and contentment, her people nobly following peaceful pursuits, and out of her generosity and abounding love for humanity sending her fair daughters to relieve the suffering of the wounded and dying, and immense cargoes from her abundant stores to save the lives of the unfortunate victims of this world's catastrophe: Therefore be it

Resolved, First. That we extend to the Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, and his able advisers, our grateful and heartfelt thanks for having preserved the peace of our country and kept us out of this maelstrom of human destruction.

Resolved, Second. That we pledge to the President our united support in any and all honorable means that he may deem necessary to preserve the peace and dignity of our country and to bring about peace among the people and nations of the world.

Resolved, Third. That a copy of this resolution, signed by our speaker and certified by our chief clerk, be sent to the President of the United States and to each of our Members in Congress.

I hereby certify that the above resolution originated in the house, and passed that body.

Adopted February 15, 1915.

ROBERT STONE,
Speaker of the House.
I. E. LAMBERT,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I want to refer, in the first place, to a statement made by my good friend from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] with reference to the passage of several bills under what he denominates "compulsion and gag rule" in this House, and the anticipated punishment by the Postmaster General of those men who refuse to be bound by the caucus.

Since the statement has been made by my friend from South Dakota I have taken occasion to inquire of three or four gentlemen in the cloakroom, who had reserved the right not to be bound by the caucus action on the shipping bill, as to whether Mr. Burleson or any other official had interviewed them with reference to their position on the immigration bill or on the shipping bill, and I found that neither of these gentlemen were interviewed by the Postmaster General or anyone in his behalf. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I also find that it is properly within the province of the minority to criticize the majority in its legislation. The majority, Mr. Chairman, is responsible for the legislation always, and at no time in the history of the country in recent years has any party been so ready to accept the responsibility of standing for the legislation that has taken place in the Sixty-third Congress as we are. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I know that my friend from South Dakota is addicted to the general habit that a great many good Republicans are in the matter of prophecy. In 1909 I heard the gentlemen on that side say the Republicans in 1910 would sweep the country in the election. In 1911 I got the same prophecy as to what they were going to do in 1912. In 1913 I heard the same statement as to what the country would do to the Democratic Party in 1914, and I expect, Mr. Chairman, to hear this year the same kind of talk as to what the Republican Party is going to do in 1916, and with the same result. The average ordinary Republican is as full of forecasts as the Weather Bureau, and not half as reliable. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I want to take occasion here to differ from my good friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] in reference to his theory of how the Government ought to be conducted. If I understood the gentleman correctly, it was that in the standardization of consuls of the United States, and in placing all of the administration officers under the civil service in the different departments of Government, we ought to establish a fixed and definite policy that should continue through the administrations that shall come after us. I do not think my friend means to say that. In this Republic, made up of parties to which the people appeal for a change of policy whenever in their opinion it ought to be made, that condition could not be effective.

Mr. CAMPBELL rose.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I have only a few minutes left.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But right on that proposition.

Mr. CLINE. The gentleman undertook to say that there should be no change in the offices held by the administration forces of the Government, except the Presidency and the secretaries of his Cabinet, and that all of the other officers—

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, the gentleman should quote me correctly. I was referring to the foreign service entirely. I make a distinction between our domestic policy and our foreign policy.

Mr. CLINE. The gentleman says that he was talking about the foreign service. The consuls in the foreign service do not affect our policy. Those policies are affected by our ministers and not by the consuls, who are the especial business agents of the United States, and they have nothing to do with the policies of the country. They are representing our business abroad and not the policy of any party.

The man that fixes the policy of the party is the titular head of the party, the President, represented through his Secretaries and other administration officers. The consuls have been put

into the classified service, into a standardized service, for the purpose of maintaining some regularity in their appointment and in the offices the duties of which they are to perform. But, Mr. Chairman, that could not possibly affect the policy of a party, and in a Republic the policies of the different parties are as distinct as it is important they should be. The policy and theory of the Democratic Party are as absolutely distinct from those of the Republican Party as it is possible to make them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the foreign policy of the Democratic Party as distinguished from the foreign policy of the Republican Party?

Mr. CLINE. The gentleman will excuse me, when I have only one or two minutes of time. I do not want him to take that away from me. I will say to the gentleman one thing—that the foreign policy of the Democratic Party is a policy of absolute neutrality and universal peace. [Applause.] We are proceeding with the head of the party to establish those relations upon strictly and absolutely neutral grounds.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was that the policy of the Democratic Party when you went down and took Vera Cruz last April?

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to another matter in this discussion. My good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] has undertaken, as several gentlemen have recently, to criticize Mr. Bryan with reference to the writing of the Vick letter. To use an everyday expression, it is a cold day when the administration is not criticized with reference to this Santo Domingo incident. Mr. Bryan assumed, however violent the assumption may have been, that even under this administration a good and deserving Democrat might be recognized when he could discharge the duties as well as a Republican and an opportunity arose to appoint him. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have no authority to speak for Mr. Bryan, other than as a Democrat to defend a man unjustly attacked when he is absent and to unqualifiedly indorse his actions in the San Domingo incident. It may be sufficient to say that through the appointment of the minister now representing this Government there that Mr. Bryan has established a stable and respectable government and wiped out some reprehensible methods.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a short question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, a short time ago I sent to the State Department and asked it to send to me a list of all the men that had been appointed, transferred, or promoted under the Consular Service from March 4, 1909, to the 20th of January, 1912. I shall not have time to read it at this time, but I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend it in my remarks by including this list.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend the letter from the State Department in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

Appointments, transfers, and promotions in the Consular Service Mar. 4, 1909, to Dec. 20, 1912.

[Italic entries indicate post held Mar. 4, 1909.]

Name and home address.	Post.	Salary.	Date.
Alger, William E., Boston, Mass.	Consul, Tegucigalpa.....	\$2,500	Nov. 10, 1904
	Consul, Puerto Cortes.....	2,500	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Mazatlan.....	2,500	Dec. 16, 1909
Anderson, George E., Springfield, Ill.	Consul general, Rio de Janeiro	8,000	Feb. 13, 1906
	Consul general, Hongkong....	8,000	May 4, 1910
Arnold, Julian H., Sacramento, Cal.	Consul, Amoy.....	4,500	May 1, 1908
	Consul, Chefoo.....	4,500	Mar. 8, 1912
Baker, E. Carleton, Alameda, Cal.	Consul, Antung.....	2,500	Nov. 10, 1909
	Consul, Chungking.....	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
Baker, Henry D., Chicago, Ill.	Consul, Hobart.....	2,000	Aug. 15, 1907
	Consul, Nassau.....	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Baugh, Hubert G., Petaluma, Cal.	Interpreter, Hankow.....	1,500	Feb. 17, 1909
	Interpreter, Mukden.....	1,500	Dec. 16, 1910
	Interpreter, Tientsin.....	1,500	Feb. 24, 1911
	Consul, Saigon.....	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, St. Pierre.....	2,000	Apr. 9, 1912
Baxter, John K., Nashville, Tenn.			
Bergh, Robert S. S., Grand Forks, N. D.	Consul, Belgrade.....	3,000	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Burslem.....	3,000	Dec. 20, 1911
Bergholz, Leo Allen, New York, N. Y.	Consul general, Canton.....	5,500	May 25, 1906
	Consul, Kingston, Jamaica....	4,500	Aug. 22, 1912
Bireh, David R., Philadelphia, Pa.	Consul, Alexandria.....	3,500	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Bahia.....	4,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Blake, Maxwell, Kansas City, Mo.	Consul, Dunfermline.....	3,000	Dec. 21, 1907
	Consul general, Bogota.....	3,500	Jan. 11, 1910
	Consul general, Tangier.....	3,500	Dec. 14, 1910
Bond, Wallace C., Cheyenne, Wyo.	Consul, Karachi.....	3,000	June 10, 1908
	Consul general, Copenhagen, resigned Jan. 1, 1911.	3,000	Aug. 27, 1909
Bonney, Wilbert L., Chicago, Ill.	Consul, San Luis Potosi.....	2,500	June 24, 1910

Appointments, transfers, and promotions, etc.—Continued.

Name and home address.	Post.	Salary.	Date.
Bray, John P., Grand Forks, N. Dak.	Consul general, Sydney, Australia.	\$5,500	June 10, 1908
Brett, Homer, Meridian, Miss.	Consul, Manchester.	6,000	(¹)
Brickwood, Jr., Albert W., Nogales, Ariz.	Consul, Maskat.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Bucklin, Jr., George A., Norman, Okla.	Consul, Puerto Cortes.	2,500	Aug. 17, 1908
Busser, Ralph C., Philadelphia, Pa.	Consul, Tapachula, resigned Mar. 1, 1912.	2,000	May 31, 1909
Byington, Homer M., Norwalk, Conn.	Consul, San Luis Potosi.	2,500	June 10, 1908
Caughy, Charles M., Baltimore, Md.	Consul general, Guatemala.	3,500	June 24, 1910
Cauldwell, Frederic W., Washington, D. C.	Consul, Erfurt.	2,500	May 31, 1909
Chamberlain, George A., Captain, N. Mex.	Consul assistant.	1,800	July 1, 1908
Chamberlain, George E., Ouronta, N. Y.	Consul, Bristol.	2,000	May 31, 1909
Chase, Benjamin F., Clearfield, Pa.	Consul, Malaga.	3,000	Apr. 29, 1907
Cheshire, Fleming D., Brooklyn, N. Y.	Consul, Milan, resigned Dec. 1912.	4,000	May 31, 1909
Clare, Arthur J., District of Columbia.	Consul assistant.	1,800	July 1, 1908
Cloud, Frederick D., Des Moines, Iowa.	Consul, Tapachula.	2,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Clum, Harold D., Saugerties, N. Y.	Consul, Pernambuco.	4,000	June 22, 1908
Coffin, Henry P., Philadelphia, Pa.	Consul, Lourenco Marques.	5,000	May 31, 1909
Coffin, William, Middleboro, Ky.	Consul, Swatow.	2,500	Jan. 10, 1910
Conner, Jacob E., Mount Pleasant, Iowa.	Consul, Cork.	2,500	June 24, 1910
Cooke, Arthur B., Spartansburg, S. C.	Consul, Leeds.	2,500	May 31, 1909
Crane, Robert T., Baltimore, Md.	Consul general at large.	5,000	May 24, 1908
Culver, Henry S., Delaware, Ohio.	Consul general, Canton.	5,500	Aug. 22, 1912
Cunningham, Edwin S., Maryville, Tenn.	Consul, Georgetown.	3,500	June 10, 1908
Damm, Henry C. A., Seawane, Tenn.	Consul, Bluefields.	3,500	Jan. 21, 1911
Daniels, Charles N., Williamantic, Conn.	Consul, Antung.	2,500	June 22, 1908
Davis, George F., Richmond, Mo.	Vice and deputy consul general in charge at Mukden. Reappointed consul, Antung, resigned Jan., 1910.	2,500	Nov. 1, 1909
Davis, Leslie A., Port Jefferson, N. Y.	Consul, Ceiba.	2,000	Mar. 13, 1912
Dawson, Claude I., Anderson, S. C.	Consul, Mazatlan.	2,500	June 2, 1909
Dawson, William, Jr., St. Paul, Minn.	Consul, Rosario.	2,500	Dec. 16, 1909
Denby, Charles, Evansville, Ind.	Consul, Mosatlan.	2,500	June 2, 1909
De Soto, Hernando, California.	Consul, Riga.	3,000	Dec. 10, 1910
Deedmeyer, Frank, Birmingham, Ala.	Consul, Cornwall.	2,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Deichman, Carl F., St. Louis, Mo.	Consul, Stettin.	2,500	May 31, 1909
Dennison E. Haldeman, Columbus, Ohio.	Consul, Sheffield.	3,000	Apr. 9, 1912
Donegan, Alfred W., Mobile, Ala.	Consul, Sherbrooke.	3,500	Sept. 25, 1908
Dorsey, W. Roderick, Baltimore, Md.	Consul, Ceiba.	2,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Doty, William F., Princeton, N. J.	Consul, Batum.	2,500	Mar. 13, 1912
Dreher, Julius D., Selwood, S. C.	Consul, Puerto Cortes.	2,500	June 24, 1910
Du Bois, James T., Hallstead, Pa.	Consul, Valencia.	2,500	Aug. 22, 1912
Dumont, Frederick T. F., Lancaster, Pa.	Consul, Sierra Leone.	2,000	(¹)
Dunning, James E., Portland, Me.	Consul general, Shanghai.	8,000	Apr. 15, 1907
Dye, Alexander V., Liberty, Mo.	Consul general, Vienna.	6,000	May 17, 1909
Dye, John W., Winona, Minn.	Consul, Riga.	3,000	June 10, 1908
Eberhardt, Charles C., Salina, Kans.	Consul, Palermo.	3,500	June 24, 1910
Edwards, Clement S., Albert Lea, Minn.	Consul, Charlotte.	2,000	May 31, 1909
Ferris, Cornelius, Jr., Denver, Colo.	Consul, Leghorn.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Fisher, Fred D., Albany, Oreg.	Consul, Tamsui.	3,000	May 4, 1908
Forman, Charles, New Orleans, La.	Consul, Nagasaki.	3,500	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Bombay.	4,000	June 22, 1908
	Consul, Dundee.	4,000	Dec. 19, 1910
	Consular assistant.	1,800	June 24, 1908
	Consul, Madgeburg.	2,500	June 24, 1910
	Consul, Jerez de la Frontera.	2,500	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Tabriz.	3,000	June 22, 1908
	Consul, Riga.	3,000	June 24, 1910
	Consul, Tahiti.	2,000	Aug. 2, 1908
	Consul, Port Antonio.	3,000	June 24, 1910
	Consul general, Singapore.	4,500	Apr. 5, 1909
	Envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Colombia.	10,000	Aug. 21, 1911
	Consul, Guadeloupe.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Madrid.	2,500	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Milan.	4,000	Apr. 11, 1905
	Consul, Havre.	5,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul general at large.	5,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Nogales.	2,500	May 31, 1909
	Resigned Jan. 1, 1913.		
	Consular assistant.	1,800	July 1, 1908
	Consul, St. Johns, Quebec.	2,000	(¹)
	Consul, Barranquilla.	3,500	May 1, 1908
	Consul general at large.	5,000	Jan. 12, 1910
	Consul, Acapulco.	2,500	Mar. 2, 1911
	Consul, Asuncion.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Malta.	2,500	(¹)
	Consul, Neuquien.	4,500	Jan. 21, 1909
	Consul general, Mukden.	4,000	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul, Turks Island.	2,000	Aug. 23, 1912

¹ Nomination pending.

Appointments, transfers, and promotions, etc.—Continued.

Name and home address.	Post.	Salary.	Date.
Foster, Paul H., Houston, Tex.	Consul, Teneriffe.	\$2,500	Nomination pending.
Fowler, John, Winchester, Mass.	Consul, Chefoo.	4,500	June 10, 1908
Frazer, Robert, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.	Consul, Foochow.	4,500	Mar. 13, 1912
Freeman, Charles M., Hillsboro Bridge, N. H.	Consul, Valencia.	2,500	July 16, 1909
Frost, Wesley, Berea, Ky.	Consul, Malaga.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Fuller, Stuart J., Madison, Wis.	Consul, Durango.	2,000	Mar. 30, 1907
Gale, William H., Leesburg, Va.	Consul, Sydney, Nova Scotia.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Gard, Allen, Orange, N. J.	Consul, Charlottetown.	2,000	Apr. 5, 1912
Garrels, Arthur, St. Louis, Mo.	Consul, Goteborg.	2,500	July 29, 1909
Gasset, Percival, Washington, D. C.	Consul, Iquitos.	3,000	Apr. 11, 1912
Gaulin, Alphonse, Woonsocket, R. I.	Consul, Malta.	2,500	Dec. 21, 1907
Gracey, Wilbur T., Boston, Mass.	Consul general, Athens.	3,000	Jan. 11, 1910
Greene, Roger S., Cambridge, Mass.	Consul, Ceiba.	2,000	Aug. 2, 1910
Griffith, P. Merrill, Sabina, Ohio.	Consul, Charlottetown; died Oct. 27, 1911.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Griffiths, John L., Indianapolis, Ind.	Consul, Zanzibar.	2,500	June 22, 1908
Guenther, Richard, Oshkosh, Wis.	Consul, Catania.	3,000	Jan. 11, 1910
Guyant, Claude E., Decatur, Ill.	Consul, Alexandria.	3,500	Aug. 22, 1912
Haebler, Arminius T., St. Louis, Mo.	Consul, Jerez de la Frontera.	2,500	June 10, 1908
Hale, Franklin D., Lunenburg, Vt.	Consul, Iquique.	3,000	Apr. 15, 1912
Hamm, Theodore C., Bancroft, Va.	Consul, Havre.	5,000	Mar. 8, 1905
Hamm, Walter C., Philadelphia, Pa.	Consul general, Marseille.	5,500	May 31, 1909
Handley, William W., Brooklyn, N. Y.	Consul, Tsingtau.	4,000	June 22, 1908
Hanna, Rea, Berkeley, Cal.	Consul, Nanking.	4,000	Apr. 15, 1910
Hannah, Frank S., Evanston, Ill.	Consul, Progreso.	3,000	Mar. 13, 1912
Hanson, George M., Ogden, Utah.	Consul, Harbin.	4,000	Jan. 21, 1909
Harris, Ernest L., Rock Island, Ill.	Consul general, Hankow.	4,500	Aug. 19, 1911
Harris, Heaton W., Alliance, Ohio.	Consul, Tampico.	5,000	Aug. 15, 1907
Haskell, Lewis W., Columbia, S. C.	Consul, Pernambuco.	4,000	Jan. 10, 1910
Hathaway, Charles M., Jr., Olyphant, Pa.	Consul general, Callao.	4,500	Nomination pending.
Hays, Perry C., Great Falls, Mont.	Consul, Liverpool.	8,000	Mar. 8, 1905
Heingartner, Alexander, New Philadelphia, Ohio.	Consul general, London.	12,000	May 31, 1909
Heintzleman, Percival, Fayetteville, Pa.	Consul general, Frankfurt.	5,500	Nov. 11, 1898
Henry, Frank Anderson, Wilmington, Del.	Consul general Cape Town.	6,000	May 4, 1910
Hill, Frank D., Pine Island, Minn.	Consul, Salina Cruz.	2,000	Mar. 8, 1912
Holder, Charles A., Colorado Springs, Colo.	Consul, Ensenada.	2,000	(¹)
Holland, Philip E., Jackson, Tenn.	Consul, Manzanillo.	2,000	June 10, 1908
Hollis, W. Stanley, Boston, Mass.	Consul, Tegucigalpa.	2,500	Jan. 11, 1910
Hoover, Charles L., Bolivar, Mo.	Consul, Vladivostok.	3,500	(¹)
Horton, George, Chicago, Ill.	Consul, Charlottetown.	2,000	May 1, 1908
Hurst, Carl Bailey, Washington, D. C.	Consul, Trinidad.	3,000	May 31, 1909
Ingram, Augustus E., Los Angeles, Cal.	Consul, Huddersfield.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Jenkins, Douglas, Greenville, S. C.	Consul, Durango.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Jewell, John F., Galena, Ill.	Consul, Hull.	2,500	July 18, 1903
Jewett, Milo A., Danvers, Mass.	Consul, Newcastle-on-Tyne.	3,000	Feb. 12, 1912
	Consul general, Boma.	4,500	June 22, 1908
	Consul, Naples.	4,000	Dec. 14, 1910
	Consul, Iquique.	5,000	Aug. 15, 1907
	Consul, Georgetown.	3,500	Dec. 20, 1911
	Consul, Magdeburg.	2,500	July 21, 1904
	Consul, Kehl, resigned Aug. 31, 1911.	3,000	June 24, 1910
	Consul, Hobart.	2,000	Aug. 23, 1912
	Consul general, Smyrna.	5,500	June 10, 1908
	Consul general, Stockholm.	3,500	Jan. 20, 1911
	Consul general at large.	5,000	Jan. 25, 1909
	Consul general, Frankfurt on the Main.	5,500	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Salina Cruz.	2,000	Jan. 11, 1910
	Consul, Hull.	2,500	Feb. 26, 1912
	Consul, Puerto Plata.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Zanzibar.	2,500	Aug. 23, 1912
	Consul, Batum.	2,500	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Liege.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Chungking.	5,000	Jan. 22, 1909
	Department of State.		Aug. 31, 1909
	Consul, Dalny.	3,500	June 24, 1910
	Second secretary, legation, Peking.	1,800	Aug. 16, 1910
	Assistant chief, Division of Far Eastern Affairs.	3,000	June 27, 1911
	Consul, Guadeloupe.	2,000	Aug. 23, 1912
	Consul general, Barcelona.	5,500	Mar. 10, 1908
	Consul general, Frankfurt.	5,500	May 4, 1910
	Died May 23, 1912.		
	Consul, Rouen.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul general, Christiania.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Puerto Plata.	2,000	Mar. 7, 1910
	Consul, Saltillo.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Lourenco Marques.	5,000	Jan. 6, 1898
	Consul, Dundee.	4,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul general, Beirut.	4,500	Dec. 19, 1910
	Consul, Madrid.	2,500	June 4, 1909
	Consul, Carlsbad.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul general, Athens.	5,000	June 22, 1906
	Consul, Saloniki.	3,500	Jan. 10, 1910
	Consul general, Smyrna.	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Plauen.	4,000	Aug. 23, 1905
	Consul, Lyon.	5,000	Dec. 14, 1910
	Consul general at large.	5,000	(¹)
	Consular assistant.	1,800	July 1, 1908
	Consul, Bradford.	3,500	June 2, 1909
	Consul, St. Pierre.	2,000	June 22, 1908
	Consul, Goteborg.	2,500	Mar. 8, 1912
	Consul, Melbourne.	5,000	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Vladivostok.	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Tsingtau.	4,000	(¹)
	Consul, Trebizond.	2,500	Dec. 11, 1905
	Consul, Kehl.	3,000	Dec. 20, 1911

¹ Nomination pending.

Appointments, transfers, and promotions, etc.—Continued.

Name and home address.	Post.	Salary.	Date.
Johnson, Felix S. S., Vine-land, N. J.	Consul, Bergen.	\$2,500	Aug. 17, 1906
Johnson, Henry Abert, Washington, D. C.	Consul, Kingston, Ont.	2,500	Jan. 10, 1910
Johnson, James W., New York, N. Y.	Consul, Liege.	3,000	Mar. 30, 1907
Johnson, Jesse H., Columbus, Tex.	Consul, Ghent.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Keena, Leo J., Detroit, Mich.	Consul, Corinto.	3,000	Jan. 12, 1909
Kehl, John E., Cincinnati, Ohio.	Consul, St. Michaels.	3,000	(¹)
Kemper, Graham H., Georgetown, Ky.	Consul, Swansea.	3,000	Mar. 30, 1907
Kent, William P., Wytheville, Va.	Consul, Matamoros.	2,500	Jan. 12, 1910
Kirk, Milton B., Chicago, Ill.	Consul, Chihuahua.	2,500	May 31, 1909
Kitchen, William W., Gulfport, Miss.	Consul, Florence.	3,000	Dec. 14, 1910
Knabenshue, Samuel S., Toledo, Ohio.	Consul, Sydney, Nova Scotia.	3,000	June 10, 1908
Lahng, James Oliver, Kansas City, Mo.	Consul, Saigon.	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
Latham, Charles L., Greenville, N. C.	Consul, Cartagena.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Lay, Julius G., Washington, D. C.	Consul general, Guatemala.	3,500	July 21, 1903
Lee, Samuel T., Ann Arbor, Mich.	Consul, Newchwang.	4,500	May 2, 1910
Leonard, Walter A., Evanston, Ill.	Consul assistant.	1,400	July 1, 1908
Letcher, Marion, Conyers, Ga.	Consul, Manzanillo.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Livingston, C. Ludlow, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Consul, Teneriffe, died Oct. 16, 1912.	2,500	Mar. 2, 1911
Long, James Verner, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Consul, Belfast.	5,000	Jan. 9, 1905
Lowrie, Will L., Elgin, Ill.	Consul general, Tientsin.	5,500	Aug. 27, 1909
Lupton, Stuart K., Clarksville, Tenn.	Consul, Malta.	2,500	Aug. 2, 1910
MacClintock, Samuel, Lexington, Ky.	Consul, Maracaibo.	2,500	(¹)
McConnico, Andrew J., Valden, Miss.	Consul, Cartagena.	2,000	Feb. 17, 1909
McGoogan, George B., Fort Wayne, Ind.	Consul, Punta Arenas.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
McNally, James C., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Consul general, Cape Town.	6,000	May 24, 1903
Magelssen, William C., Bratsberg, Minn.	Consul general, Rio de Janeiro.	8,000	May 2, 1910
Mahin, Frank W., Clinton, Iowa.	Consul, Nogales.	2,500	Aug. 15, 1907
Manning, Isaac A., Salem, Ore.	Consul, San Jose, Costa Rica.	3,000	May 31, 1909
Mason, Dean B., Cleveland, Ohio.	Consul, Stavanger.	2,000	Aug. 23, 1912
Maynard, Lester, San Francisco, Cal.	Consul, Acapulco.	2,500	June 2, 1907
Memminger, Lucien, Charleston, S. C.	Consul, Chihuahua.	2,500	Jan. 10, 1911
Michelson, Albert H., Cambridge, Mass.	Consul, Salina Cruz.	2,500	Jan. 10, 1910
Miller, Clarence A., Kansas City, Mo.	Consul, Swansea.	3,000	Jan. 10, 1910
Miller, Henry B., Eugene, Ore.	Consul, Venice.	2,000	Aug. 15, 1907
Moffat, Thomas P., Brooklyn, N. Y.	Consul, Malta.	2,500	Jan. 10, 1910
Moorhead, Maxwell K., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Consul, Venice.	2,000	Aug. 2, 1910
Morawetz, Albert R., Nogales, Ariz.	Consul, Erfurt.	2,500	June 10, 1908
Morgan, Henry H., New Orleans, La.	Consul, Carlsbad.	3,000	May 31, 1909
Moser, Charles K., Lewinsville, Va.	Consul general, Lisbon.	3,500	Aug. 22, 1912
Mosher, Robert Brent, Washington, D. C.	Consul, Catania.	3,000	Feb. 10, 1909
Myers, David J. D., La Fayette, Ga.	Consul, Karachi.	3,000	Aug. 27, 1909
Nathan, Edward I., Philadelphia, Pa.	Consul, Tampico.	3,000	(¹)
Northrup, Alfred S., Chicago, Ill.	Consul, Tegucigalpa.	2,500	May 31, 1909
Norton, Edward J., Memphis, Tenn.	Consul, Puerto Cortes, resigned Apr. 16, 1910.	2,500	Dec. 16, 1909
	Consul, St. John's, Quebec.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Owen Sound.	2,500	(¹)
	Consul, La Paz, Mexico.	2,000	June 27, 1906
	Consul, Progreso.	3,000	June 2, 1909
	Consul, Georgetown; died at Mobile, Ala., Aug. 29, 1911.	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Nanking.	4,000	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul, Tsingtau.	4,000	Apr. 15, 1910
	Consul, Hanover.	3,000	(¹)
	Consul, Colombo.	3,000	Feb. 20, 1909
	Consul, Melbourne.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Nottingham.	4,500	June 11, 1902
	Consul, Amsterdam.	5,000	May 4, 1910
	Consul, La Guaira.	3,000	Feb. 18, 1909
	Consul, Barranquilla.	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, assistant.	1,800	July 1, 1903
	Consul, Algiers.	2,500	Dec. 18, 1911
	Consul, Vladivostok.	3,500	Mar. 11, 1908
	Consul, Harbin.	4,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Amoy.	4,500	Aug. 20, 1912
	Consul, assistant.	1,600	July 1, 1908
	Consul, Salina Cruz.	2,000	(¹)
	Consul, Turin.	2,000	Jan. 29, 1906
	Consul, Hanover.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Milan.	4,000	(¹)
	Consul, Matamoros.	2,500	Aug. 15, 1907
	Consul, Tampico.	3,000	Jan. 11, 1910
	Consul, Pernambuco.	4,000	(¹)
	Consul general, Yokohama.	6,000	Mar. 8, 1905
	Consul, Belfast; resigned Nov. 8, 1910.	5,000	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul, Trinidad.	3,000	Feb. 17, 1909
	Consul, Bluefields.	3,500	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Managua, resigned Mar. 29, 1911.	3,000	Jan. 20, 1911
	Consul, Acapulco.	2,500	Jan. 13, 1908
	Consul, St. John, N. B.	3,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Rangoon.	3,500	Apr. 15, 1910
	Consul general at large.	5,000	Aug. 14, 1907
	Consul, Leipzig, retired Aug. 1912.	4,000	Jan. 12, 1910
	Consul, Amsterdam.	5,000	Apr. 29, 1907
	Consul general, Barcelona.	5,500	May 11, 1910
	Consul, Aden.	2,500	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Colombo.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Port Elizabeth.	3,500	Nov. 21, 1908
	Consul general, Hankow.	4,500	Jan. 11, 1910
	Consul, Plauen.	4,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Puerto Cortes.	2,500	Aug. 24, 1912
	Consul, Patras.	2,000	Aug. 15, 1907
	Consul, Messina.	2,500	May 4, 1909
	Consul, Karachi.	3,000	(¹)
	Consul, Trebizond.	2,500	Mar. 8, 1912
	Consul, Asuncion.	2,000	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul, Malaga.	3,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Bombay.	4,000	Aug. 22, 1912

Nomination pending.

Appointments, transfers, and promotions, etc.—Continued.

Name and home address.	Post.	Salary.	Date.
Olivares, José de, St. Louis, Mo.	Consul, Managua.	\$3,000	June 23, 1908
Osborne, John Ball, Scranton, Pa.	Consul, Madras.	3,000	Jan. 27, 1911
	Chief, Bureau of Trade Relations, Department of State.	2,500	May 17, 1905
Paddock, Gordon, New York, N. Y.	Consul, Havre.	5,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Patton, Kenneth S., Charlottesville, Va.	Consul, Tabriz.	3,000	June 24, 1910
Perry, Chas. B., Crete, Nebr.	Consul assistant.	1,400	Aug. 24, 1908
Pike, William J., Hallstead, Pa.	Consul, Asuncion.	2,000	(¹)
Pontius, Albert W., St. Paul, Minn.	Consul, Turin.	2,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Potter, Julian, New York, N. Y.	Consul, Kehl.	3,000	Mar. 30, 1907
Ragsdale, James W., Santa Rosa, Cal.	Consul, Reichenberg.	4,000	June 24, 1910
Rasmussen, Bertil M., McCallsburg, Iowa.	Consul, Swatow.	2,500	Jan. 22, 1909
Ravndal, Gabriel Bie, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Consul, Chungking.	3,500	Jan. 10, 1910
Ray, John A., Whitewright, Tex.	Consul, Dalm.	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
Reat, Samuel C., Tuscola, Ill.	Consul, Nassau.	3,000	Oct. 30, 1903
Robert, Albert W., Palm Beach, Fla.	Consul, Rouen.	2,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Robertson, William H., Richmond, Va.	Consul, St. Petersburg.	3,500	June 10, 1908
Rosenberg, Louis J., Detroit, Mich.	Consul general, Halifax.	4,500	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul, Stavanger.	2,000	June 22, 1905
	Consul, Bergen.	2,500	Jan. 12, 1910
	Consul general, Beirut.	4,500	June 22, 1906
	Consul general, Constantinople.	6,000	Dec. 10, 1910
	Consul, Maskat.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Maracaibo.	2,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Corinto.	3,000	(¹)
	Consul, Port Louis.	2,000	June 22, 1908
	Consul, Tansui.	3,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Algiers (retired, 1911).	2,500	May 31, 1909
	Consul general, Tangier.	3,500	Jan. 13, 1909
	Consul general, Callao.	4,500	May 2, 1910
	Consul general, Moscow.	5,500	(¹)
	Consul, Seville.	3,000	June 28, 1906
	Consul, Pernambuco.	4,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Barranquilla (declined appointment to Barranquilla and resigned Jan. 15, 1910).	3,500	Jan. 12, 1910
	Consul general, Vienna.	6,000	Mar. 26, 1903
	Consul general, Hongkong (died at post Apr. 15, 1910).	8,000	May 17, 1909
	Consul general, Seoul.	5,500	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul general, Yokohama.	6,000	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul, Bagdad.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Ensenada, retired June 3, 1911.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Aguascalientes.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Aden.	2,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Nagasaki.	3,500	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul, Kobe.	5,000	June 2, 1909
	Consul general, Seoul.	5,500	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul, Mannheim.	3,500	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul, Sherbrooke.	3,500	Mar. 21, 1912
	Consul, Fiume.	3,500	Aug. 20, 1912
	Consul general, Moscow.	5,500	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Lyon.	5,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Belfast.	5,000	Dec. 14, 1910
	Consul, Aguascalientes.	2,000	Apr. 9, 1907
	Consul, Martinique, resigned Apr. 19, 1910.	2,500	Apr. 13, 1910
	Consul, Bagdad.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Ensenada.	2,000	June 8, 1911
	Consul, Nogales.	2,500	(¹)
	Consul, Sarnia.	2,500	July 16, 1909
	Consul, Merina.	2,500	Mar. 5, 1909
	Consul, Patras.	2,000	May 7, 1909
	Consul, Aguascalientes, resigned Apr. 8, 1911.	2,000	Apr. 13, 1910
	Consul, Kobe.	5,000	June 10, 1908
	Consul general, Moscow.	5,500	May 31, 1909
	Consul general, Sydney, Australia.	5,500	(¹)
	Consul, Port Antonio.	3,000	June 22, 1906
	Consul, Kingston, Jamaica.	4,500	June 7, 1910
	Consul, Leipzig.	4,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Tegucigalpa.	2,500	(¹)
	Consul, Madras.	3,000	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Durban.	3,500	Dec. 19, 1910
	Consul, La Paz, Mex.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul assistant.	1,800	July 1, 1903
	Consul, Belgrade.	3,000	Dec. 20, 1911
	Consul, Cornwall.	2,000	Mar. 13, 1912
	Consul, Port Louis.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Stavanger.	2,000	Jan. 10, 1910
	Consul, Trinidad.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul General, Callao.	4,500	June 22, 1906
	Consul, Nottingham.	4,500	May 2, 1910
	Consul, Stettin.	2,500	Feb. 20, 1909
	Consul, Mannheim.	3,500	Apr. 9, 1912
	Chinese secretary at Peking.	3,600	Mar. 11, 1908
	Consul, Nanking.	4,000	Mar. 13, 1912
	Consul, Hanover.	3,000	June 20, 1906
	Consul, Sheffield.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Puerto Plata.	2,000	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Maracaibo.	2,500	Mar. 7, 1910
	Consul, Trieste.	3,000	Aug. 23, 1911
	Consul, Cape Gracias a Dios.	2,000	June 21, 1905
	Consul, Niagara Falls.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Kingston, Jamaica.	4,500	May 8, 1907
	Assistant Solicitor, Department of State.	3,000	June 23, 1910
	Consul, Lyon.	5,000	(¹)

Nomination pending.

Appointments, transfers, and promotions, etc.—Continued.

Name and home address.	Post.	Salary.	Date.
Van Sant, Howard D., Island Heights, N. J.	Consul, Kingston, Ontario...	\$2,500	Sept. 15, 1905
Voetter, Thomas W., Santa Fe, N. Mex.	Consul, Dunfermline...	3,000	Jan. 11, 1910
Wakefield, Ernest A., Augusta, Me.	Consul, Saltillo...	2,000	Aug. 15, 1907
Wallace, Thomas R., Atlantic, Iowa.	Consul, La Guaira...	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Warner, Southard P., Kensington, Md.	Consul, Rangoon...	3,500	June 10, 1908
Washington, Horace Lee, Washington, D. C.	Consul, Port Elizabeth...	3,500	Jan. 11, 1910
Weddell, Alexander W., Richmond, Va.	Consul, Jerusalem...	3,000	Mar. 30, 1907
West, George N., Washington, D. C.	Consul, Martinique...	2,500	June 24, 1910
White, Jay, Lapeer, Mich.	Consul, Leipzig...	4,000	Aug. 9, 1904
Wilber, David F., Oneonta, N. Y.	Consul, Bahia...	4,000	Aug. 27, 1909
Wilder, Amos P., Madison, Wis.	Consul, Harbin...	4,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Williams, Charles L. L., Columbus, Ohio.	Consul general, Marseille...	5,500	June 10, 1908
Williamson, Adolph A., Washington, D. C.	Consul, Liverpool...	8,000	May 31, 1909
Willrich, Gebhard, Milwaukee, Wis.	Consul, Zanzibar...	2,500	Jan. 11, 1910
Winans, Charles S., Chelsea, Mich.	Consul, Catania...	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Winslow, Edward D., Chicago, Ill.	Consul general, Vancouver...	4,500	June 10, 1908
Wood, John Q., Honolulu, Hawaii.	Consul, Kobe...	5,000	Aug. 26, 1910
Yerby, William J., Memphis, Tenn.	Consul general, Bogota...	3,500	June 22, 1906
	Consul, Santos...	4,000	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul general, Halifax...	4,500	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul, Kobe...	5,000	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul general, Vancouver...	4,500	Aug. 26, 1910
	Consul general, Hongkong...	8,000	Mar. 7, 1908
	Consul general, Shanghai...	8,000	May 17, 1909
	Interpreter, Chefoo...	1,500	July 1, 1908
	Interpreter, Newchwang...	1,500	July 6, 1909
	Consul, Swatow...	2,500	June 24, 1910
	Student interpreter, in Japan...	1,000	Oct. 8, 1906
	Consul, Antung...	2,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, St. Johns, New Brunswick...	3,000	Oct. 3, 1905
	Consul, Quebec...	3,500	June 9, 1909
	Consul, Valencia...	2,500	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul, Seville...	3,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Tahiti...	2,000	June 24, 1910
	Consul, Goteborg...	2,500	Jan. 22, 1909
	Consul general, Stockholm...	3,500	Mar. 29, 1909
	Consul, Planen...	4,000	Dec. 14, 1910
	Consul general, Copenhagen...	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Venice...	2,000	Jan. 12, 1910
	Consul, Tripoli...	2,500	Aug. 2, 1910
	Consul, Sierra Leone...	2,000	June 28, 1908
	Consul, Mersina...	2,500	(1)

(1) Nomination pending.

Mr. CLINE. That statement was made out and delivered to me about January 20, 1912, by the then Secretary of State, Mr. Knox. I am not an extreme partisan, but I wanted to know the facts connected with the Consular Service in which the appointments were made under the farce of a civil service examination stripped of political preferences. He sent me the names of the gentlemen who have been promoted, who have been appointed, who have been transferred to these positions. There were 212 out of 289 consuls of the United States when this new law became effective. I asked for the home address, the place to which they were appointed, and the salary, and when they were appointed or transferred. Out of the 212 I found that 199 were Republicans, and that there were 13 Democrats appointed in four years, or promoted or transferred, and that out of \$726,500 of salaries, the Democrats drew \$31,500, or less than 5 per cent of the amount that was paid to those men in those situations. The State of Massachusetts, that the gentleman [Mr. ROGERS] comes from, had five men appointed or transferred in that time, whose salaries equaled more than half of the entire amount that was coming for a year to the 13 representatives of the Democratic Party in the Consular Service, and yet the gentleman finds fault because a Democrat gets into the service.

The State of Illinois had 13 representatives appointed or transferred during the four years, commanding salaries amounting to \$43,500. The great State of Pennsylvania had 18 representatives appointed, transferred, or promoted during this time, carrying salaries amounting to \$62,000, twice the amount paid to the Democratic representatives for the entire United States. Only two of the 13 were appointed north of the Mason and Dixon line. What kind of salaries did they get? Six of them got \$2,000 a year, three of them got \$2,500 a year, three of them got \$3,000 a year, and one \$3,500 a year, and all of them occupying inferior and unimportant positions.

Mr. Chairman, that is an exemplification of the administration of the holy civil service under a Republican administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Charges d'affaires ad interim and vice consuls, \$50,000; total, \$587,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee the reason for putting the vice consuls separately in this item and not having them included under the general designation

for the Consular Service? I did not know that vice consuls were a part of the ambassadorial or legation force.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the reason for putting them there was that they might participate in this fund of \$50,000. The gentleman will recall that a few weeks ago Congress passed a law classifying the Consular Service and the secretaries of embassies and legations, and provided that vice consuls when acting as consuls should get the same proportion of the consul's pay that the charges d'affaires do of the ambassador's or minister's pay.

Mr. STAFFORD. I should think that would be included under the item, page 19, which relates to salaries of the Consular Service, rather than in this connection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. What item?

Mr. STAFFORD. Page 19, the paragraph with the heading "Salaries of the Consular Service."

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The item on page 19 is for the salaries of consuls and consuls general. This item back here is a specific appropriation heretofore to pay the first secretary who is acting in the place of an ambassador or a minister half of the salary of such ambassador or minister when he was away from his post of duty. Now, under the new law we recently enacted, the vice consul acts in place of the consul general in the absence of such officer from his post of duty and gets half of the salary of that officer, and we put vice consuls in here in order that they might participate in this fund.

Mr. STAFFORD. The vice consul, of course, will not have any duties to perform connected with a legation or embassy.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is why I asked the gentleman why it should be included here if it is really part of the Consular Service.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It may have been better to have divided the appropriation and put it in a different place.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES OF SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE.

For secretaries in the Diplomatic Service as provided in the act of January —, 1915, entitled "An act for the improvement of the foreign service," approved January —, 1915, \$157,500; *Provided*, That the amount appropriated for "Salaries of secretaries of embassies and legations" contained in the act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, is hereby made available for the salaries of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service at the rate of compensation specified in the act entitled "An act for the improvement of the foreign service," approved —, 1915; and there is also hereby appropriated for salaries of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of the said act of January —, 1915, during the remainder of the fiscal year 1915, the additional sum of \$7,500.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a point of order pending.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Well, let the gentleman make it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to make the point of order, at least I do not know that I do, but I want to inquire of the chairman of the committee in reference to this matter. This is apparently a deficiency appropriation. That is an appropriation for the current year.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That was necessitated by reason of the fact on February 5 of this year the law went into effect reorganizing the service of secretaries of embassies and legations, and increased the compensation of secretaries taken as a whole to an amount that would equal this \$7,500 for the last four months of this fiscal year. The purpose of this proviso here is to enable the State Department to pay the balance of appropriations of this year which was made for secretaries of embassies and legations under the old system to the secretaries under the new law, and adds \$7,500 for the purpose of making their salaries what they would be under the new law from the 1st of March to the 1st of July.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Does not the gentleman think it would be a better form of appropriation for this to have been carried in the deficiency bill rather than in this bill? It is a deficiency.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Well, I do not know; I do not believe, under the circumstances, it would.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact this is simply a deficiency, as he is appropriating for the current fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. That is, the \$7,500 is a deficiency?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. And my question was if the gentleman did not think it would be better, at least, to have that amount carried in a deficiency bill rather than in this appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from North Carolina will permit, when the consular reorganization bill was passed there was some discussion whether the bill itself ought not to make available the existing appropriations for the payment of the reorganized service.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I recall it.

Mr. MANN. The fact is the gentleman from Virginia really wanted to have that done, although the way it came up it is probably not convenient; but as this is to make the present appropriations available for salaries, I can see there is some reason—

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I want to say to the chairman of the committee I shall not press the point of order, but I merely wanted to call his attention to the fact that this item belongs to a deficiency bill and not to this bill. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer four amendments to this section, all the same. On page 2, line 26, strike out the word "January" and insert "February 5."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 26, by striking out "January" and inserting "February 5."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. On page 3, line 2, strike out the word "January" and insert "February 5."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 3, line 2, by striking out the word "January" and inserting "February 5."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. On page 3, line 10, insert the words "February 5" after the word "approved."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, after the word "approved," insert the word and figures "February 5."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. On page 3, line 14, strike out the word "January" and insert "February 5."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 3, line 14, by striking out the word "January" and inserting the word and figure "February 5."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay the salaries of ambassadors, ministers, consuls, and other officers of the United States for the periods actually and necessarily occupied in receiving instructions and in making transits to and from their posts, and while awaiting recognition and authority to act, in pursuance of the provisions of section 1740 of the Revised Statutes, so much as may be necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the Chairman kindly indicate what appropriation is used for these respective services? One would expect there would be some amount appropriated in this paragraph, but none is included, and none was included in last year's act also.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is provided for by the Revised Statutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The appropriation?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Whatever is necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. From what fund is the money paid? Here is an item without carrying any appropriation.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The Revised Statutes authorize it to be paid, and it is paid out of any money in the Treasury.

Mr. STAFFORD. But I assume the money is appropriated somewhere.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Here is the amount paid.

Mr. STAFFORD. Which amount?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman from North Carolina asked me what amount was paid. Last year it was \$109,700.

Mr. STAFFORD. But where is the money appropriated?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The Revised Statutes provide that it shall be a charge on the Treasury. Whenever the State Department draws on the Treasury for money on this account it is paid.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a very exceptional case. I never knew of the Revised Statutes carrying an unlimited appropriation.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. We frequently impose an obligation on the Treasury, and when the conditions called for in the Revised Statutes are complied with, there is a payment. It is not unusual, though probably not the wisest method of legislating.

Mr. STAFFORD. When the statutes authorize the expenditure of the money and designate the sum, what is the need of carrying the paragraph?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It has been carried in this bill so long if it was left out some question would arise as to its payment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is the amount of money from which it is paid? That is the question that is difficult for me to understand.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is paid out of any money in the Treasury. I can not make it plainer than that. We do not make any specific appropriation here. We simply recognize an existing law.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman from Virginia allow a question?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Then, whatever amount is paid out of the Treasury, out of this particular provision, is not included in the aggregate of the amount carried in this bill?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In other words, if the amount appropriated in the bill is in excess of the amount shown in the report, such amount is paid in this paragraph?

Mr. STAFFORD. And last year the amount expended was \$109,000?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. One hundred and nine thousand and some odd dollars.

The Clerk read as follows:

Interpreter to legation and consulate general at Bangkok, Siam, \$1,500.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of interrogating the chairman of the committee in regard to the item we had under consideration at the top of this page. What is the reason that the amount that is necessary to meet this obligation can not be carried in the appropriation bill?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. There is no reason why it can not be done. The committee has just followed the custom of years.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. There are some customs that ought to be revised, and I should have thought that the gentleman from Virginia in taking charge of this bill would have been on the lookout for things of this sort.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think the committee has in the last two years been on the lookout and revised a good many of them.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Now, the result of this is that here is an appropriation bill on its face carrying a certain sum of money—

Mr. COX. How much?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Something over \$4,000,000.

And the facts are that the bill carries appropriations of an amount of money in excess of that—an undetermined amount. No Member of the House could possibly know how much. The chairman of the committee says that something like \$109,000 was expended under this item last year. Has the chairman of the committee any information as to what amount will likely be expended during the current year for which this appropriation is made?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think it will be less this year than the year before.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Was information obtainable when the gentleman was constructing this bill to enable him and his committee to make a fairly accurate estimate of the amount of money that will be required under this item?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It will evidently be considerably less than it was last year, because there were more changes in the Diplomatic Corps last year than there will be this year.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman then could have carried in this bill as an appropriation for this purpose, say \$100,000, using the language, "or so much thereof as may be necessary," which would have fixed the amount that the bill carried.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. We could have done that.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I suggest to the gentleman next year in making up this bill that he take that under consideration.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In order that we may know what amount of money we are appropriating.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am much obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I withdraw the pro forma amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

For 10 student interpreters at the legation to China, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the Chinese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the legation and consulates in China, at \$1,000 each, \$10,000: *Provided*, That said student interpreters shall be chosen in such manner as will make the selections nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to con-

tinue in the service as interpreter to the legation and consulates in China so long as his said services may be required within a period of five years.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee how the selections are made of these 10 student interpreters. Who has the power of naming them?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The State Department names them.

Mr. GOULDEN. And there is no civil service?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. They put them through a civil-service examination of their own. There is none provided by law.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does the gentleman know what particular requirements are demanded of those who apply for that examination—the age, educational qualifications, and so forth?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. They have to speak an additional language to the English language and stand an English examination. They have to be educated.

Mr. GOULDEN. Has the gentleman any idea about what age they have to be?

Mr. COX. I think it is from 18 to 35 years. I had an opportunity to look that up a few years ago.

Mr. GOULDEN. This looks like a fine opportunity for young men to see other countries. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESCUING SHIPWRECKED AMERICAN SEAMEN.

Expenses which may be incurred in the acknowledgment of the services of masters and crews of foreign vessels in rescuing American seamen or citizens from shipwreck, \$4,500.

THE SEAMEN'S BILL.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The Democratic Party came into power with a distinct platform promise to aid American seamen. Involuntary servitude on ships was to be ended forever. The priceless boon of freedom and liberty was to be guaranteed to the men who go down to the sea in the ships. Their independence and self-respect was to be encouraged. This doctrine was not only incorporated in the platform pledges, but it was proclaimed from the throats of a thousand spellbinders of greater or less force and magnitude throughout the Nation. All the coast cities were raided with these sturdy declaimers and their fair promises. Congress convened and the shipowners assembled. They lobbied and they explained. Every argument and influence they could summon was brought into play. The chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries was in London at a conference, and delay was necessary. Finally when it became apparent that the foreign shipowners were deceiving the public as to safety provisions and were sandbagging the seamen at that conference, Andrew Furuseth, the seamen's representative in this country, who was serving as one of the American delegates, packed up his belongings and left. He told the people of the United States that the shipping interests had control of that international conference.

Finally the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, who is himself independent and faithful to duty, returned to his post here in this Congress. The report of the conference and the treaty it proposed was sent to the Senate for ratification.

Silence was the special order in the House committee on the much advertised promise of the Democracy to abolish involuntary servitude. Months passed and on my own motion the committee finally found itself in position to lay aside temporarily such questions as the renaming of merchant ships, the creation of lobster beds and fish hatcheries, and other matters and consider the seamen's bill which Senator LA FOLLETTE had forced through the Senate months and months before.

In the meantime there came up on this floor a recodification bill, and the statute on which involuntary servitude was based was read and reenacted. My motion to strike out the statute, which had been denounced as un-American by the Democratic platform, was rejected and the law was actually reenacted in violation of the platform.

Finally the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries wiped out the La Follette bill, all except the enacting clause, and reported a substitute which was so objectionable that the representative of the seamen of America, Andrew Furuseth, urged all friends of the seamen and of safety at sea to vote against the bill as reported. I had submitted a minority report against the bill. The committee got together again and submitted a further much improved substitute which was passed and sent over to the Senate about six months ago.

The international treaty was pending and action on the bill was continually delayed. In the meantime another election approached. The Democratic Party went before the people to

answer for its legislation and to tell how it had redeemed its platform pledges. A campaign textbook was issued and in violation of propriety, as it appears to me, the seamen's bill was referred to as one of the accomplishments of that session of Congress.

But the seamen's bill all the while rested quietly in the hands of Senate and House conferees, where it still lodges, and I fear is sleeping the sleep that knows no waking. The Shipping Trust is watching the bill. We are within 10 legislative days of adjournment. No report from these conferees is forthcoming, and rumors about the Capitol tell that they have about agreed on a report that will be pleasing to shipowners and will greatly displease the seamen.

It is doubtful, very doubtful, if any bill reported by these conferees can pass unless it meets with the tacit approval of the Shipping Trust and the all-night talkers in another House.

Plain, ordinary decency demanded a prompt report from these conferees long ago. Andrew Furuseth, in his position as to the international treaty, has been vindicated, for the treaty has been rejected because by its terms it made this legislation impossible. It seems to me that unless this bill is passed there will have been a deplorable lack of good faith and sincerity on the part of the Democratic Party in this matter.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. I just wanted to ask the gentleman relative to this provision appropriating for "the expenses which may be incurred in the acknowledgment of the services of masters and crews of foreign vessels in rescuing American seamen or citizens from shipwreck, \$4,500." The gentleman proposes to strike out this appropriation of \$4,500, and yet at the same time he speaks in behalf of the American seamen. It seems to me as being inconsistent.

Mr. BRYAN. Instead of the gentleman, as one of the leading representatives of the Democratic Party, taking up the proposition I submitted, he tries to take this motion of mine to strike out the last word, and which I took as the ground to present the argument I did present, and fails to refer to the real matter I presented. Why does not the gentleman say something about the seamen's bill and explain why his party and those in power here in this House and the other House fail and neglect to bring out this bill? There is a vast majority of this House in favor of it and a majority in the other House; yet it is absolutely neglected and no attention is paid to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HARRISON. I want to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Washington. It strikes me he is trying to blow hot and cold at the same time.

We have not the American seamen's bill up now. I voted for the shipping bill and I am for the seamen's bill. We are now trying to do something for some oppressed seamen and trying to appropriate \$4,500 for them in this bill. This is the item that is now up for consideration.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say—

Mr. HARRISON. I do not yield now. This is the item that we must now vote on. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike from this bill this item of \$4,500 that is recommended to be appropriated for the seamen of this country. We are bound to conclude that the gentleman is sincere in his motion, and I oppose it, and I do not think the House ought to accept the view of the gentleman from Washington and strike out this item of \$4,500 for the seamen of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I trust that this amendment will not be adopted. It is to strike out the appropriation of \$4,500 for rescuing shipwrecked American seamen. The item has been carried in this appropriation bill for 30 years, and it has accomplished much good in behalf of shipwrecked American seamen. I trust the committee will vote down the gentleman's amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can not do that. I make a point of order on that. There is a motion already pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] is out of order. He will have to get unanimous consent.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYAN. I do not propose to allow the RECORD to show that I am opposed to this appropriation of \$4,500. Those who

may read the RECORD will know that the motion was offered in order to present this matter to these two gentlemen; and now, not only the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] but the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill, gets up and, instead of answering the question I propounded in regard to the seamen's bill and its merits, indulges in the same joke that the gentleman from Mississippi has attempted to perpetrate on the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is a motion now pending.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I object.

Mr. BRYAN. I would like to call attention to the fact that the Democrats are really by their action advocating the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. They will not strike it out.

Mr. BRYAN. They would like to strike out everything connected with the seamen's bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion that is pending before the House is that of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] to strike out the last word. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the commission to continue its work under the treaties of 1884, 1889, and 1905, \$7,500: *Provided*, That \$5,000 thereof is made immediately available to resume and continue the work relating to the distribution of water, under the direction of the Secretary of State, and as authorized by and in pursuance to the protocol of May 6, 1896, between the United States and Mexico, and to enable the commission to study the questions connected with the equitable distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande River between the citizens of the United States and Mexico, and to make an investigation under the supervision of the Secretary of State as to the best and most feasible method of preserving the boundary line between the United States and Mexico by preventing the flood waters of the Rio Grande and its tributaries where the said Rio Grande constitutes said boundary line from disturbing and changing the channel, and also the best and most feasible mode of impounding, regulating, and utilizing said waters in such manner as to secure to each country and its inhabitants their legal and equitable rights and interests in said waters, and to report in detail plans, findings, and conclusions to Congress not later than December 10, 1915.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAY). Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to correct the spelling of the word "tributaries" on lines 2 and 3 of page 11.

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice, Mr. Chairman, in the report that the Department of State recommended an appropriation of \$50,000 in connection with this boundary commission, and the committee has reduced the amount appropriated last year from \$15,000 to \$7,500, and yet makes available for expenditure this year \$5,000.

First, I would like to inquire how much of the appropriation of \$15,000 is now available and the reason for the deficiency appropriation of \$5,000; and next, the reason for this new authorization about boundary lines between Mexico and Texas, along the Rio Grande.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is not new. It was in the bill of last year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, it is all new, I will say to the gentleman, after the first four lines of the proviso.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. What does the gentleman mean by the first four lines?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. The language is new from the beginning of line 15, page 10, down to the end.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what I said—that all after the first four lines is new. The proviso begins on the fourth line.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The appropriation of \$7,500 is made under treaties between this country and Mexico. There is a commissioner on the part of this country and one on the part of Mexico to establish and keep established, so far as that can be done, the boundary line between this country and Mexico, and an appropriation of \$7,500 was made under this treaty. There is another commission, which has been acting under a protocol between this country and Mexico and under the authority of the State Department for quite a number of years, to determine the amount of water of the Rio Grande that citizens of the United States are entitled to and the amount that citizens of Mexico are entitled to.

As far as the boundary-line question is concerned, owing to the disturbed conditions in Mexico there is very little that can be done, and this appropriation was made simply for the pur-

pose of keeping the treaty alive until conditions got better in Mexico.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman furnish to the committee a statement of the amount under the \$15,000 appropriation that is now unexpended?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think it is all expended.

Mr. STAFFORD. With nobody representing Mexico, and still the representative has gone ahead and spent \$15,000, and you are asking for only \$7,500 next year under the same conditions?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman must remember that we inherited these two commissions from a preceding administration. One of them was authorized under a treaty made by an administration prior to this one, and there were a number of officials employed to take the measurements of the waters of this river and kept an office at El Paso and one in Washington. The officials were there, and while they were not doing as much work as they might have done they still were there, and on the pay rolls of the Government. We reduced the appropriation from \$50,000 to \$15,000, and under that they could keep only a portion of these officials, but they still kept enough of them to consume this \$15,000, doing work which, while not strictly under these treaties, was of very great importance to the people on the American border in the State of Texas and work that the State of Texas and the citizens of that State were greatly interested in. We thought they could get along with even less than \$15,000, and we cut it down to \$7,500, which was enough to keep the organization in existence, so that when matters settle down in Mexico the commission will be there, the treaty will be alive, and our commissioner can cooperate with the Mexican commissioner in settling the questions that arise by reason of the changing channel of the Rio Grande River and the questions that have arisen in the past as to the equitable distribution of water.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then it is expected that this commissioner will, during the ensuing fiscal year, spend only \$2,500?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The boundary-line commission will spend only \$2,500.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman think \$2,500 will be sufficient to undertake this new work of providing an irrigation system for the Rio Grande?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I do not think it will be sufficient for any purpose in the world except to keep the commission alive. I do not think they can do very much work; but they will be there, and the treaty will be complied with by us, and the institution will be ready to be reestablished and go to work when Mexico gets into a condition to appoint a commissioner on her part.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand, then, that the commissioner, or the attachés connected with the commission, need some new work in order to justify their keeping themselves employed.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Not some new work.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what you are delegating in this paragraph.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; the gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what you are delegating in this new authorization.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; that work has been done for years. The difference between this bill and previous bills is that formerly the authorization was not made by Congress, but an appropriation of \$50,000 was made, and the State Department, under prior administrations, diverted the larger part of this \$50,000 to do this work that we have specified here in the second part of this section, without, as we thought, any authority of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Since the new administration has taken hold, do I understand that the new commissioner has done none of the work authorized in this new authorization?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, yes; he did it; but he did it under the authority of Congress in the last appropriation act.

Mr. STAFFORD. There was no such authority in the appropriation act as that contained in the lines following line 20.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It may not have been as specific and detailed as it is in this bill, but still the authority existed.

Mr. GARNER. The authority is given in the treaty.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understood, last year there was a jumble of authority, and the commissioner who had been appointed found that there was no system whatsoever, and he

went up to the State Department and protested about the conditions existing and claimed that there were duplications of work and the like, and thereupon the committee rearranged this item and provided a special authorization, as carried in last year's appropriation bill.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; the gentleman is mistaken about that. The committee itself inserted the provision in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was so represented to me by some persons attached to this commission.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Whoever informed the gentleman from Wisconsin was mistaken. The committee saw that that work had not been authorized by law. It was being done, and it was a very valuable work, and the committee put in this provision authorizing it.

Mr. STAFFORD. It must be very valuable if they are going to appropriate only \$2,500 for the ensuing year. Therefore I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the amount that has been appropriated, which I think will be interesting to the committee. Since the question of an international boundary between the United States and Mexico arose we have expended \$409,000. The appropriations ran year by year from \$20,000 to \$25,000, and when the new auxiliary came into existence the appropriation of larger sums, as high as \$50,000, took place, so that the entire amount expended has been \$656,000. The reason the appropriation is only \$7,500 was because the committee thought that was sufficient to keep the commission alive, as we knew that there could not be anything done during the present conditions in Mexico, except what would have to be done over again.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice that from the State Department there was a proposition to construct on the upper part of the Rio Grande an irrigation project known as the Engle Dam, and it was thought that they ought to have \$50,000 for another project. How much has been expended on the Engle Dam?

Mr. GARNER. About \$12,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Texas says about \$12,000,000; that comes under the irrigation laws.

Mr. GARNER. We have no public lands in Texas.

Mr. COX. I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana, has this entire sum of money been expended for clerk hire and salaries?

Mr. CLINE. This goes way back to 1884, and that amount has been expended in keeping gaugers and engineers and surveyors, maintaining an office here at this capital in connection with it.

Mr. COX. It is all gone for salaries practically?

Mr. CLINE. Yes; and in determining the boundary rights of the Mexican people and ourselves.

Mr. COX. I do not know anything about the geography in that territory down there.

Mr. CLINE. A part of the money has been expended to determine the geography and where the boundary line was.

Mr. COX. Is it a fact that the Rio Grande is constantly changing its channel backward and forward, washing people that live in the United States over into Mexico, and vice versa?

Mr. CLINE. That is what the committee understands, and the further proposition is added to it to devise ways and means whereby the flood waters of the upper part of the Rio Grande can be impounded and saved.

Mr. COX. How long has that attempt been carried on to impound the flood water of the upper part of the Rio Grande?

Mr. CLINE. It is under advisement; there has been no attempt made to establish reservoirs.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman understand that the project is contemplated to ultimately create the erection of a great dam to impound the headwaters of the Rio Grande and prevent its overflow?

Mr. CLINE. No; I do not understand that there is any proposition determined. That is one of the things the country will have to consider.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have just come in, and I did not hear all the debate on this paragraph. I think it has not been brought out just how the amount in question came to be recommended in the bill. We have been hearing a good deal in the last weeks and months, and very properly, too, about the need of economy in every department of government. We have been told that every Secretary and every subordinate was being urged and required to prune down estimates to the very lowest possible cent. I have in my hand the estimates for the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill of 1916 furnished the Committee on Foreign Affairs by the Department of State. On

page 13 of that print I find that in place of the \$15,000 which was allotted last year for this Mexican Boundary Commission the sum of \$50,000 is recommended this year, an increase of \$35,000, or some 300 per cent, over last year.

When the commissioner of that boundary commission, the Hon. John Wesley Gaines, came before the committee he was naturally asked why that increase was necessary at this time, when, as we all know, the boundary conditions are of the most chaotic description, and when it was obvious that in any bilateral undertaking, such as the settlement of a boundary, there could be no effective work done toward fixing that boundary.

Several questions were asked Mr. Gaines along that line. In the course of the testimony he said he had not been consulted in advance by the Department of State as to what amount should be called for. He said he had no knowledge, until the moment he came before our committee, of the amount asked for in behalf of his mission. Then this question was asked him:

What figures would you suggest in substitution for the \$25,000 and the \$50,000?

Mr. GAINES. Make it \$25,000 for the waterworks, or so much thereof as is necessary—the usual way when we do not exactly know—and let it be used under the administration of the Secretary of State, and say so literally.

Then, again, later, this question was asked him:

You have not given us in terms what you say you ought to have in place of the \$50,000.

Mr. GAINES. I am not an engineer, and I do not know what it would cost. Let it be \$25,000, or so much thereof as is necessary, for waterworks.

Mr. ROGERS. Instead of the \$50,000.

Mr. GAINES. Yes; we do not need \$50,000; I have looked far enough into it to see that.

Of course it did not need the testimony of Commissioner Gaines; it was obvious that with the prevailing conditions on the Mexican border, \$50,000 could not be judiciously expended there, nor any appreciable part of that sum. The committee thought it was wise and necessary to keep the commission alive, and having heard the testimony of Mr. Gaines, having considered the recommendation of the Department of State, cut the sum down from the \$50,000 which the State Department asked, from the \$25,000 which the commissioner asked, to \$7,500.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the recommendation of the Department of State, in these days when the most rigid economy is required in all branches of Government, for three or four times as much as last year, without reason and without foundation, was an insult to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, was an insult to this body. I maintain that those recommendations ought to be made with prudence and foresight, discrimination and care, and that we can not have the slightest confidence in any recommendation unless we know that their advice has been carefully considered by the Department of State, that it represents due study and accurately reflects present-day conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there are two typographical errors in this paragraph that ought to be corrected at this time. Mr. FLOOD of Virginia rose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from Virginia that we correct those typographical errors in lines 3 and 8.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the typographical errors will be corrected.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Rogers] that the fact that the State Department sent an estimate greater than it turned out was needed to the Committee on Foreign Affairs was an insult to that committee. I think, on the contrary, it showed that the State Department had confidence in the committee, and knew that the committee would investigate the estimate and not make a report in favor of an estimate that was not justified by the facts and the law. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the way the State Department fell into this error was because for years, under Republican administrations, they had been sending estimates for this and giving appropriations for \$50,000 for this commission, when it was doing no more work than it did last year on \$15,000. I think the committee is deserving of the thanks of the House, as it has the confidence of the State Department, for investigating the estimates so carefully and reporting to this House only such sums as are necessary to properly carry on the work of the projects under that department. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia surely was not serious when he said that they did as much work last year as they did some years ago upon this boundary commission?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am serious in that; yes.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman is not informed as to the facts. There is no work being done on this boundary commission now to speak of. We are paying a salary to a former Member of this House—and I have no objection to that—to maintain the commission alive; but for many years before the Mexican trouble got bad they were really working on this boundary commission.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. If the gentleman makes the statement that they did any work, he is ignorant of the facts.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I am not. I took the trouble to look this up, something which probably the gentleman has not done. There was a great deal of actual work done on this boundary commission, actual work in the field as well as in the office. It is a mere honorary position now, a sinecure.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It was a sinecure before, and for years the only thing the commission did was to work on what is known as the Chamizal case, being a litigation between citizens of this country and citizens of Mexico to determine in which country about 600 acres of land at El Paso was located. For years an appropriation of \$50,000 was made to keep up this commission, with a long list of high-paid officials, and, so far as we were able to find out, the only work they accomplished was the work they did on this Chamizal case, determining in which country a few ranches were located. When these gentlemen who constitute this commission came before the committee they themselves could tell of no other work that had been done. I was justified in saying that the work done by this commission last year upon \$15,000 was as great as the work that had been done heretofore for \$50,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of State to mark the boundary and make the surveys incidental thereto between the Territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada, in conformity with the award of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal and existing treaties, including employment at the seat of government of such surveyors, computers, draftsmen, and clerks as are necessary; and for the more effective demarcation and mapping, pursuant to the treaty of April 11, 1908, between the United States and Great Britain, of the land and water boundary line between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, as established under existing treaties, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, including the employment at the seat of government of such surveyors, computers, draftsmen, and clerks as are necessary, and commutation to members of the field force while on field duty, actual expenses not exceeding \$2.50 per day each, to be expended in accordance with regulations from time to time prescribed by the Secretary of State, \$40,000, together with the unexpended balance of previous appropriations for these objects: *Provided*, That hereafter advances of money under the appropriation, "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada, and the United States and Canada," may be made to the commissioner on the part of the United States and by his authority to chiefs of parties, who shall give bond under such rules and regulations and in such sum as the Secretary of State may direct, and accounts arising under such advances shall be rendered through and by the commissioner on the part of the United States to the Treasury Department as under advances heretofore made to chiefs of parties.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Wisconsin reserve a point of order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That can not be done until the point of order is disposed of.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why the provision is inserted on page 12, line 7, "that hereafter advances of money, etc.," thereby making permanent law?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it was in order to pay promptly the parties that the commissioners sent up on the Canadian boundary line. The representation made to the committee was that when the vouchers had to go through the State Department the pay was delayed and these parties were a long time getting their pay. It was practically done in this way before, but they wanted authority of law. They had been doing it in this way, but some question was raised by the Auditor of the State Department, and in order to prevent delay in paying these rodmen and laborers and others they wanted the matter made clear. We understand that the work will probably be completed within a year or two.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That being true, there was less necessity for making it permanent law than if it were going to continue for a longer period of time.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No. These men go up into the woods in Maine and they have a great deal of trouble getting up there and they need their pay promptly.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. What is the reason that that can not be done without this proviso?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. My recollection is that Dr. Tittmann said they would have to get a voucher for each man and it

would have to come back and be certified by the State Department before the auditor would pay.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Well, if the gentleman would leave out the word "hereafter," it would effect the same purpose.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The purpose of this was to make it only apply to this particular appropriation.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and offer an amendment to strike out the word "hereafter" in line 7, page 12.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The amendment is acceptable.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have a reservation of a point of order pending. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree with the chairman of the committee, so far as the present explanation has been made, that there is any urgent need of giving the chairman of this commission full authority to control the moneys expended by the commission. We are acquainted with conditions existing in other branches of the service where the persons who perform work in the field receive their money direct and are obliged to give vouchers therefor, and I do not think it is a very good system of accounting to pay over the money entirely to one man, even though he is under bond, and allow him to determine whether the money is properly expended by his subordinates. I think it is a better system of checks and control to have the individual employees give vouchers, as in the Postal Service, rather than depute to one man the privilege and have the money go through his subordinates without check or control. Now, it is true the Coast and Geodetic Survey has it to some extent, but I question whether we should depart from the present practice; and unless the gentleman can give some further reason, I shall feel constrained to make the point of order on the proviso.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Here is what the commissioner said:

The system of direct advances to chiefs of parties has caused serious delays, principally because as much as a month elapses between the time a field officer makes requisition for funds and the date he receives notice that they are placed to his credit, and, further, because the system of direct advances to field officers imposes upon them the necessity of extensive accounting.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to say to the gentleman that I read the report, but it did not satisfy me there should be any change made. Here under the existing practice the chief of parties receives these moneys, and he accounts for them and is obliged to give vouchers. If we pay all that money over to one man there will be no check whatsoever, but merely the bond received from the various individuals.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. And the account he renders for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The comptroller and auditor do not pass upon those. I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be a bad practice to adopt this policy, and therefore I make the point of order on the proviso, beginning line 7, page 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, by inserting after the word "necessary," in line 2, page 12, the following: "And including a sum not exceeding \$50 per month as additional compensation for the clerk of the Coast and Geodetic Survey disbursing these funds."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. Does the gentleman wish me to reserve it?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will reserve it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to carry out what was recommended by the State Department. The State Department recommended that the chief clerk of the Coast and Geodetic Survey be paid an additional \$50 per month as disbursing agent. Now, when this commission was organized, in 1903, the chief clerk was asked to take charge of the disbursements, and for many years he continued this work until it became quite onerous. In 1913 a letter was written to the chief clerk, Nicholas G. Henry, which is as follows:

MARCH 24, 1913.

Mr. NICHOLAS G. HENRY,
Coast and Geodetic Survey, Washington, D. C.

SIR: At the request of Mr. O. H. Tittmann, Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, you are hereby appointed a special disbursing agent of this department to disburse, under the direction of Mr. Tittmann, so much of the appropriation of \$75,000 provided for in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act of April 30, 1912, and the unexpended balance of previous appropriations as may be actually necessary to mark the boundary and make the surveys incidental thereto between the Territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada in conformity with the award of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal and existing treaties and for the more effective demarcation and mapping, pursuant to the treaty of April 11, 1908, between the United States and Great

Britain, of the land and water boundary line between the United States and the Dominion of Canada as established under existing treaties.

It has been decided to allow you \$50 per month for your additional services as special disbursing agent of the department, to cease when in the judgment of Mr. Tittmann your services are no longer required.

A blank form of bond for execution by you in the penal sum of \$20,000 is herewith inclosed, together with three cards which you are requested to sign for the use of the accounting officers of the Treasury Department.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

ALVEY A. ADEE,
Acting Secretary of State.

Now, Mr. Henry entered upon the work and for several months he received \$50 per month, but the auditor in looking over the accounts decided that there was no authorization for this \$50 per month, and, though he was doing the work and had been paid, decided that he could not be paid because there was no authorization. So he put it up to the comptroller and the comptroller decided definitely that the payment could not be made, because there was no authority for it.

Now, Mr. Henry has continued to do that work. He is a splendid and efficient man. He gets only \$1,800 a year, and he has spent the larger part of his leave each year in catching up with this disbursing work and tabulating it, and so forth. In fact, I believe he received last year nine and three-eighths days of his entire leave, and the balance of it he spent on his books in this matter. Each and every day during the year he keeps these accounts. He can not do it during his time in the office, because he has too much other work to do, and he does it after his hours are over, at night. He is a man who knows how to do it, has made a splendid official, and he has been in the department for years, and has been doing this work. The State Department wants him to have the \$50 per month; the State Department, under Acting Secretary of State Adees, wanted him to have the \$50 per month; and there is no authorization for it. He has been doing the work outside of his regular official duties, and he has been giving a bond of \$20,000 for the faithful performance of that work, and the premium on that \$20,000 bond he has been paying out of his own pocket. He could not complain, because he accepted the job, and he believed he was going to get the \$50 a month, but the comptroller found he could not be paid. I know this gentleman, and I believe that you, if you could see him and talk to him, would find out, as I have found out, that this is a meritorious case and that he is entitled to this money.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to have the gentleman yield to me long enough to ask the chairman of the committee who acts as disbursing clerks of these other commissions?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have only a couple of minutes. I will not yield for a question as to some other commissions. If you want to ask about this one, all right.

Mr. BORLAND. It strikes me that this can not be an isolated case. It must occur in other commissions.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think there must be some money provided out of which they are paid in those other funds. I am anxious that this man should receive this extra \$50 a month, because he has performed the duty, and the State Department says he ought to have it and they recommend it. We did not have all the facts before us, and it was stricken out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a remark or two concerning the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. COX. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to increasing the salaries, especially of this commission. It has been the most expensive piece of work that this Government has ever undertaken by way of a commission. We have expended on the boundary line between Alaska and Canada—and I am not finding any particular fault with that, because the difficulties necessarily encountered to establish the boundary line there are very great—we have expended in establishing the boundary line between Alaska and Canada \$668,000 in round numbers.

Mr. COX. How long has it been running?

Mr. CLINE. From 1905 to 1912. The unfinished work, which was a very small amount, was then transferred from the Alaska boundary line to the commission that had charge of the boundary line between the United States and Canada, and the total amount expended between the United States and Canada, and that work consisted chiefly of remonumenting the line, the line having been established some time about 1850. But we have expended in remonumenting that line \$749,176, and this commission did not have jurisdiction over more than 1,000 miles of the line between the United States and Canada. Over 1,000 miles of the line is a water boundary under the jurisdiction of another commission. It illustrates the absolute necessity for some different manner of making appropriations

for these commissions. As I have said, we expended \$749,176 to establish the Canadian boundary. To survey the Northern Pacific Railroad from 1866 to 1870—and I understand they made three surveys; that is, they surveyed three different routes—the directors of the organization spent only \$250,000. I am not including the amount, of course, that the Government paid for sending the Army along to keep the Indians off the survey. But the actual expenses of the survey by the directors of the Northern Pacific Railroad were \$250,000, and yet we have spent in remonumenting this line between the United States and Canada \$749,176, and the end is not yet.

I shall incorporate at this point in my remarks the data furnished me by the State Department showing the amounts appropriated, available, and expended, respectively, on the boundary between the United States and Alaska and between the United States and Canada year by year since the projects have been undertaken.

Appropriation, "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada," for fiscal years 1905 to 1912.

Year.	Appropriations and balances.	Total available.	Expenditures.	Balances.
1905.....	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$36,206.40	\$63,793.60
1906.....	65,000.00	128,793.60	49,191.53	79,602.07
1907.....	163,793.60			
1908.....	25,000.00	104,602.07	59,893.27	44,708.80
1909.....	179,602.07			
1910.....	50,000.00	94,708.80	78,553.52	16,155.28
1911.....	144,708.80			
1912.....	75,000.00			
1903.....	116,155.28			
1910.....	100,000.00	191,155.28	189,477.36	1,677.92
1911.....	100,000.00			
1912.....	1,677.92			
1912.....	200,000.00	301,677.92	225,106.27	76,571.65

¹ Available balances from previous appropriations reappropriated and made available for expenditure during succeeding fiscal year.

The appropriations, "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada" and "Boundary line, United States and Canada," were combined by Congress for the fiscal year 1913, the unexpended balances of both appropriations being reappropriated and made available for use, together with the new appropriation, under the title, "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada and United States and Canada."

Appropriation, "Boundary line, United States and Canada," for fiscal years 1904 to 1912.

Year.	Appropriations and balances.	Total available.	Expenditures.	Balances.
1904.....	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$64,399.48	\$35,600.52
1905.....	100,000.00	135,600.52	67,064.42	68,536.10
1906.....	135,600.52			
1907.....	50,000.00	118,536.10	25,864.19	92,671.91
1908.....	168,536.10			
1909.....	20,000.00	112,671.91	6,297.69	106,374.22
1910.....	192,671.91			
1911.....	20,000.00	126,374.22	19,730.78	106,643.44
1912.....	1106,374.22			
1909.....	20,000.00	126,643.44	36,954.85	89,688.59
1910.....	1106,643.44			
1911.....	25,000.00	114,688.59	65,026.75	49,661.84
1912.....	189,688.59			
1911.....	105,000.00	154,661.84	66,747.57	87,914.27
1912.....	149,661.84			
1912.....	95,000.00	182,914.27	91,939.76	90,974.51
1912.....	187,914.27			

¹ Available balances from previous appropriations reappropriated and made available for expenditure during succeeding fiscal year.

The appropriations, "Boundary line, United States and Canada," and "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada," were combined by Congress for the fiscal year 1913, the unexpended balances of both appropriations being reappropriated and made available for use, together with the new appropriation, under the title, "Boundary line, United States and Canada and Alaska and Canada."

Appropriation, "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada and United States and Canada," fiscal years 1913 to 1915.

Year.	Appropriations and balances.	Total available.	Expenditures.	Balances.
1913.....	\$75,000.00	\$242,546.16	\$182,851.29	\$59,694.87
1914.....	190,974.51			
1915.....	276,571.65	159,694.87	122,298.82	37,396.05
1914.....	100,000.00			
1915.....	59,694.87	137,396.05		
1915.....	100,000.00			
1915.....	37,396.05			

¹ Available balance from appropriation "Boundary line, United States and Canada, 1912."

² Available balance from appropriation "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada, 1912."

³ Available balances from appropriations for 1913 and 1914, reappropriated and made available for expenditure during fiscal years 1914 and 1915, respectively.

I want to say that it illustrates the viciousness of making a lump-sum appropriation to these commissions. Of course, they say a man ought not to complain about a method for expending money when he has no better theory to advocate, but there is not a man here who is acquainted with private business who would turn over such sums to be expended without better supervision. And we have made available in several instances more than \$250,000 to this commission to dip into and spend here and there wherever they thought it was necessary. I say that is a waste of public funds. It is illustrated by a remark I once heard from a great Republican orator who is now deceased. He said that Uncle Sam would spend a dollar as though it was a leaf and that leaf as though he owned the whole unbounded forest. I simply make the statement that we are compelled to take these estimates from men who are interested always in increasing their respective appropriation, and we have no way of determining the actual amount necessary. We ought not to make such an appropriation as this, and for that reason the committee at this time cut down the amount that was appropriated to \$40,000 and made available the unexpended balance. The commission last year worked from about the 1st of May to the 1st of October. Of course, the surveyors come back and make a permanent record of the field notes and the topographers make the necessary maps in connection with the survey. But no man can make me understand that it is necessary to spend in remonumenting the line between the United States and Canada \$746,000, with two or three years yet to run.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, on page 12, line 3, after the word "duty," the comma and inserting the word "or."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 12, line 3, by striking out, after the word "duty," the comma and inserting the word "or."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether that is the proper thing to do; but the language of the bill as it reads, I think, can not be understood. It says, "Commutation to members of the field force while on duty, actual expenses not exceeding \$2.50 per day each," and so forth. If the commutation is to be limited to \$2.50, then the amendment that I have offered is the proper amendment.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. What is the language now?

Mr. MANN. "Commutation to members of the field force while on duty, actual expenses not exceeding \$2.50 per day each." In either case the amendment I offer limits the commutation.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LINTHICUM. In reference to what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] says about increasing salaries, I think this stands on a different basis from the ordinary increase. Here is a man who was appointed by the Secretary of State to do this work. He was ordered to do it, and he took out a bond of \$20,000, and he has been disbursing over \$200,000 each year. He was receiving \$50 a month for this service, according to the Secretary's own letter. Yet you say he should not have it. If he took that appointment in good faith and has done the work and given the bond and paid for it out of his own pocket in all equity he is entitled to the increase promised him by the department.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. CLINE. Is not that the argument that any man can make about increasing his salary?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No. Here is a man who is appointed to an office outside his regular duties. He is ordered to give a bond. He gives a bond, and he pays for it out of his own pocket, and does the work, and now you say he ought not have the salary promised him.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Is it not a fact that this salary was contracted for and paid for some years and then under a ruling of the auditor he had to refund?

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is a fact that he received it for several months, and when the auditor said there was no authority for it, he received it no longer; and then the State Department

recommended that it be put into the bill, so that he would have the authority to pay him.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do.

Mr. STAFFORD. When was that decision made?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know exactly; but it was about three months after March 4, 1913—in June or July. There was a decision to the effect that he could not receive it. He has since been doing the work and paying the premium on the bond.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is his salary?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Eighteen hundred dollars. He is earning it. I am sorry that the gentleman saw proper to make the point of order to that. It is a just claim.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Is there any question about the authority of the official who wrote that letter and made that promise?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know anything about the authority he had. He was the Acting Secretary of State. I presume he thought he had the authority. He thought the money could be paid out of the regular fund as compensation for his services as disbursing agent, and he told him to go ahead and do it, and he did it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL PRISON COMMISSION.

For subscription of the United States as an adhering member of the International Prison Commission, and the expenses of a commission, including preparation of reports, \$2,550.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. What does the evidence show as to what that \$2,500 is expended for?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It began many years ago, I think in 1846. I think the organization was effected on the initiative of this country. Conferences are held every five years. Twenty nations are members of it. The object is to study the treatment of criminals, to promote prison reform, the general suppression of crime, and the rescue of children. The United States became a member 20 years ago. The first regular appropriation we made was in 1897. The quota was paid to the prison bureau at Berne, Switzerland. The American commissioner is Dr. Charles R. Henderson. He is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State. His reports have to be made to the Secretary of State.

Mr. BORLAND. How much was the first appropriation?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The same as this one.

Mr. BORLAND. About \$2,500 a year?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. How does it happen that our expenses as one member of that body run \$2,500 a year? With the meeting only once in five years, how can they absorb that amount of money?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. They keep a bureau at Berne, with a considerable number of clerks and officials in it, and get out very valuable literature. There are only 20 adhering nations, so that does not mean a very large total amount of money. They pay in proportion to the population, I think, so they do not all pay as much as we do.

Mr. BORLAND. There is a meeting only once in five years?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. They meet only once in five years, but the work is kept up all the time. The bureau is maintained regularly.

Mr. BORLAND. Once in five years we send representatives, do we?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Once in five years there is a meeting of the representatives of these different nations.

Mr. BORLAND. Do we have an additional expense at that time?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; this appropriation covers that.

Mr. BORLAND. Are all of the expenses paid out of this fund?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The expenses of our commissioner, Dr. Henderson, of Chicago, are paid out of it; yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought something in the hearings of the committee would show what they spent the money for.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Some of it is spent in publication work.

Mr. BORLAND. Do we have a separate employee there?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No.

Mr. BORLAND. No American representative?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; but the reports are published and sent out.

Mr. BORLAND. I take it when we have occasion to send a delegate to that meeting we send some American official who is in Europe, convenient to the place of the meeting, do we not?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Dr. Charles R. Henderson, of the University of Chicago, goes as our delegate.

Mr. BORLAND. What is his official position?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Dr. Charles R. Henderson, of the University of Chicago, is the representative of this country in that congress.

Mr. BORLAND. That amount seems to be a good deal in comparison with the amount we pay for keeping up the bureau for the suppression of the African slave trade. That is only \$125.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. But the activities of this bureau are much larger. The printing is considerably more.

Mr. BORLAND. I suppose the committee have looked into it to see whether this continuing expense ought to go on.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I notice in the hearings, according to the statement of Mr. Carr, that this is the sum contributed annually, and that it has remained the same for many years, although the population has increased; that it is now proposed to request the Government to contribute the maximum sum mentioned, namely, 50 francs for each 1,000,000 inhabitants, and that several governments have already signified their intention to grant this increased contribution. This is the quota of the United States in that amount.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Has the gentleman from Virginia any objection to recurring to page 12, line 24, for the purpose of inserting a comma after the word "Continent"? There should be one there.

Mr. FOSTER. The enrolling clerk has the power to correct the punctuation.

Mr. MOORE. I ask unanimous consent to insert a comma after the word "Continent," in line 24, page 12. I do not press it at all unless the gentleman from Virginia agrees to it. As it reads there it says, "in a certain defined zone of the African Continent of firearms."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to insert a comma after the word "Continent," in line 24, page 12. If there be no objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAN AMERICAN UNION.

Pan American Union, \$75,000: *Provided*, That any moneys received from the other American Republics for the support of the Union shall be paid into the Treasury as a credit, in addition to the appropriation, and may be drawn therefrom upon requisitions of the chairman of the governing board of the Union for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the Union and of carrying out the orders of said governing board: *And provided further*, That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, authorized to print an edition of the monthly bulletin not to exceed 6,000 copies per month, for distribution by the Union during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee what amount of money has been contributed by the different American Republics.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. To the Pan American Union?

Mr. GOULDEN. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The rest of them contribute \$50,000.

Mr. GOULDEN. I notice it says here—

That any moneys received from the other American Republics for the support of the union shall be paid into the Treasury as a credit, in addition to the appropriation, and may be drawn therefrom upon requisitions of the chairman of the governing board of the union for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the union and of carrying out the orders of said governing board.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is based on population.

Mr. GOULDEN. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF ARBITRATION.

To meet the share of the United States in the expenses for the calendar year 1914 of the International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, created under article 22 of the convention concluded at The Hague, July 29, 1899, for the pacific settlement of international disputes, \$1,250.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the chairman's attention again to the fact that here is a very important international organization, and our contribution to that is only \$1,250. It does seem on further investigation that \$2,550 for a

prison commission is an amount that is not properly represented by the amount of work that we get out of them.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The committee did not agree with the gentleman about that. They did make inquiry into it, and as the gentleman from Mississippi called the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to the fact, it was the purpose to increase it rather than to decrease it. They seem to have the idea that the work that is appealing to the different countries which are parties to it is a work that is valuable to those who are interested in improving prison conditions all over the world.

Mr. BORLAND. I have never seen or heard of any of their work, so it can not be very far-reaching.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman from Illinois by my side and the gentleman from Illinois on the other side and the committee have inquired into it, and they are all of the opinion that the work is very valuable, and probably next year there will be a proposition to increase the appropriation.

Mr. BORLAND. And I think the proposition will not be met. Twelve hundred and fifty dollars for the international bureau of the permanent court of arbitration is a very reasonable sum, but \$2,550 for a prison commission seems to me more than we get out of it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I will.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I make the suggestion that the amount of which the gentleman speaks as being somewhat extravagant carries a delegate?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. A commissioner.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I used the word delegate to bring out the idea of a representative. In the Hague tribunal the appropriation does not cover the delegate, but only our proportional part for the maintenance of the bureau itself.

The Clerk read as follows:

The judge of the said court and the district attorney shall, when the sessions of the court are held at other cities than Shanghai, receive in addition to their salaries their necessary actual expenses during such sessions, not to exceed \$10 per day for the judge and \$5 per day for the district attorney; and so much as may be necessary for said purposes during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, is hereby appropriated.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire the reason why you single out the district attorney and pay his actual expenses, and not accord the same consideration to the marshal and the clerk when they are obliged to accompany the court when held at some other place than Shanghai.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. We do it in the interest of economy.

Mr. STAFFORD. You have been doing it all along, and it is not fair treatment. Why single out one and deprive the other two, who have equally meritorious claims, when they are obliged to accompany the court when held at a place other than Shanghai? If the gentleman is going to economize, why not eliminate all? Why single out the higher officials and leave the fellows with smaller salaries to pay their own expenses?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am willing to eliminate all of them. We have carried this provision for years. We inherited it and have not thought to change it.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Illinois will allow me, I think they have a court bailiff at each place.

Mr. STAFFORD. But they have no clerk.

Mr. MANN. I think they have.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been informed that they have not, and that the clerk is obliged to accompany the court to each place.

Mr. MANN. They could have a clerk at each place.

Mr. STAFFORD. I say that the clerk is entitled to his expenses as well as the marshal.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The clerk and the marshal can have deputies at these places.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman realizes that that would cost a great deal more than it would to pay their expenses, at not to exceed \$5 a day, when accompanying the court.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The marshal could not have a deputy unless he paid him, because his salary is fees.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt he has a bailiff.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not sufficiently advised about that, but I do not believe that the gentleman or his committee is in favor of putting a wet blanket on the judge and district attorney holding court at other places than at Shanghai when the purpose of justice demand, which would happen if you struck out these lines.

I will not offer an amendment this year, but I would like to have the gentleman and his committee next year inquire into as to why the clerk and the marshal should not receive the same treatment.

Will the gentleman kindly bear in mind next year an inquiry into whether there is any reason for not paying the clerk's

expenses if he accompanies the court, as I understand he does.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; we will look into it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I do so for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. I have understood that in this court in China, where we are paying a total of \$28,800 a year, that there are not more than a dozen cases a year, and that those are of trivial importance.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is mistaken. I made a special inquiry of a gentleman in the State Department, whom I believe is as well informed as anyone in this country about this, and he told me that the business was considerable.

Mr. BAILEY. I understood from a gentleman who has been practicing before that court more or less, and was told within an hour, that there were very few cases.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Who is the gentleman to whom the gentleman alludes?

Mr. BAILEY. A Mr. Curtis.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. He has been before committees of Congress here for the last four or five years making representations about this court that an investigation of our committee does not show to be correct.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman was before a committee of which I have the honor to be a member a few months ago and made certain charges, which were so well sustained that the judge against whom they were filed was compelled to retire, and did retire.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. There is now another judge there.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I referred to his statement about there being no business before the court. I was informed, as I say, by an official of the State Department that there was a great deal of business in this court and that Mr. Curtis's statement in reference to that matter is incorrect. He made that statement to me. I do not know that he ever appeared before the committee, but he made it to me personally, and he has been around Congress here making attacks on this court for a number of years on account of differences which he had with the judge who has resigned.

Mr. BAILEY. I have also been informed, whether correctly or not, that the district attorney in the China court was not a lawyer at all.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, that is a mistake. I think the gentleman is a young lawyer, but he is a lawyer, and a good one.

Mr. BAILEY. The allegation is made that he is not a lawyer at all.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that I have a friend who is to be marshal of this court and who is also a lawyer.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I believe this court is of sufficient importance to be retained in China on account of the conditions in the Orient at the present time, and even if there were no cases before the court it should be retained for the purpose of maintaining the dignity and standing of the country. The fact of the matter is that many cases are brought before this court, and the marshal made many arrests last year. He made 8 or 10 arrests in December. What I want to call the attention of the committee to is the fact that, while the marshal may have a deputy and the clerk may have a deputy at places where the court is held other than Shanghai, there is but one stenographer connected with the court, and his salary is \$1,800 a year, and out of that \$1,800 a year he has to pay all of his traveling expenses and his hotel bills while he is absent from the location of the court at Shanghai. I think that next year the committee ought to arrange for the proper care of these lower paid officials.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, United States agency: Two counsel, at \$2,520 per annum; one stenographer, at \$1,200 per annum; and messenger, \$720 per annum; in all, \$4,440.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to move to strike out the words "in all, \$4,440."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 25, strike out the words "in all, \$4,440."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the item says "two counsel, at \$2,520 per annum." Is it intended to have two counsel at that sum each?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It would be necessary to say "each," then; and then the gentleman could move to change the total. As the bill reads without the word "each" the two counsel combined would get \$2,520.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the intention of the committee is to provide for two counsel at \$2,520 each, and I make that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 24, after the word "annum," insert the word "each."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Now I suggest that the gentleman correct the total.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the former amendment in respect to the total and offer another amendment, to change the figures "\$4,440" to "\$6,960."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 25, strike out "\$4,440" and insert "\$6,960."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a few questions in regard to this item, in which I notice that there is a considerable reduction. I certainly do not take any exception to that, but I am interested in knowing exactly how the committee arrived at a knowledge of what particular positions should be eliminated. For instance, I notice here that the bill provides for two counsel at \$2,540 each. At the same time the committee has eliminated the position of joint secretary provided for under current law. I assume the gentleman will say that this economy was made possible by the fact that it is not expected that the commission will be able to do much during the next fiscal year toward the settlement of claims. If that be true, I do not understand why you want two counsel. It seems to me a secretary might be needed for the purpose of taking care of the business and papers, and so forth, of the commission.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman the committee thought this tribunal would be able to do very little work during this year, but it was constituted under a treaty, and we thought it wise to keep the tribunal together and to keep some person in charge of the office who would take charge of the papers, the books, the briefs that had been prepared when the tribunal last met; and in doing that we decided to dispense with the high-priced lawyers, such as the agent at \$7,500, the attorney at \$5,000, also dispensing with the law clerk at \$1,800; and we kept those two attorneys, one of whom would act as disbursing officer, and they could work on those cases during the time between now and the next assembling of the tribunal, and by making this arrangement we save \$40,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Do I understand it is expected that one of the counsel shall act in the place of the secretary?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Act as disbursing officer instead of the joint secretary; that was the idea the committee had.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The item does not say so; it makes no provision for that.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The duties may be imposed upon him by the Secretary of State.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I was going to suggest there is no work for a joint secretary while the commission is not in session, and this work is being carried on and the pending cases are being carried on by these two counsel.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. From the statement made by the gentleman from Virginia, it seems to me the only work that is expected to be done by this commission during the next fiscal year would be such as is usually done by a secretary.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. This is not the secretary. This is the joint secretary, the secretary who acts and works when England and the United States are both represented.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am not going to offer any amendment, for if I had any idea of doing so I do not think it would be adopted; but from the statement made in detail of the duties of these counsels it seems to me they are more peculiarly the duties of the secretary rather than of a counsel, as I understood the gentleman to say that about all to be done was to look after the papers, books, and briefs, and keep the records straight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Just a moment. No; the joint secretary acts as disbursing officer of this tribunal, and we think one of these attorneys can do that, and then they could spend their time preparing cases that they already have, so as to be ready to submit them to the tribunal when it next meets; but I believe the result will be that the State Department will not keep at least one of them. I think there is only one there at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fisheries convention, United States and Great Britain: For the payment of the actual and necessary expenses of a commissioner on the part of the United States under the convention between the United States and Great Britain concerning the fisheries in waters contiguous to the United States and the Dominion of Canada, signed at Washington on April 11, 1908, while engaged in work under the convention, including clerical expenses that may be incurred in carrying out the convention during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman from Virginia whether this commissioner is the commissioner who agreed to a convention between this country and Canada that has not been approved?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I could not hear him.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to know whether the commissioner provided for in this fisheries matter is the commissioner who agreed to a convention between the United States and Canada that has not been approved?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will ask unanimous consent to pass over the next paragraph temporarily.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the next paragraph be passed temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to pass the next paragraph temporarily. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES OF THE CONSULAR SERVICE.

For salaries of consuls general and consuls, as provided in the act approved January —, 1915, entitled "An act for the improvement of the foreign service," \$1,060,000: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated for salaries of consuls general and consuls contained in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," approved June 30, 1914, is hereby made available for salaries of consuls general and consuls at the rate of compensation specified in the act entitled "An act for the improvement of the foreign service," approved January —, 1915; and that there is also hereby appropriated for salaries of consuls general and consuls, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of the said act of January —, 1915, the additional sum of \$13,333.35.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer several amendments to that. The first one is in line 15, page 19, to strike out the figures "\$1,060,000" and insert "\$1,069,000." It was a typographical error. The amount the committee intended to report was \$1,069,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Then, in line 13, strike out the word "January" and insert "February 5."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. And then, on the same page, line 24, strike out the word "January" and insert "February 5."

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. And on page 20, line 3, the same amendment, to strike out "January" and insert "February 5."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, just for the purpose of calling the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that this is also a deficiency appropriation, and, that he may not overlook it when he comes to draw the bill a year from now, I wish to say that it is in line with the first item of the bill that I called to his attention.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the pro forma amendment, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPENSES OF CONSULAR INSPECTORS.

For the actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses of consular inspectors while traveling and inspecting under instructions from the Secretary of State, \$15,000: *Provided*, That no inspector shall be allowed expenses for subsistence in excess of \$10 per day.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. This proviso authorizes \$10 a day for subsistence, I think that is too much. When we passed the consular reorganization bill, I think in that bill, as far as they were concerned, we changed it to \$5 a day.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Five dollars a day.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman willing to do that here?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "\$10" and insert "\$5."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 12, strike out "\$10" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Allowance for clerk hire at consulates, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, \$493,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I notice that here is an increase in these Democratic times of \$117,800 in clerk hire alone. The committee states it is occasioned by substituting American clerks for clerks of the domicile where these consular offices are established, and also by reason of increased work. Can the gentleman inform the committee how much is due directly to increase of salaries occasioned by the employment of American clerks and how much by reason of increased service?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The proposition is to increase the clerical force at the consulate and to eliminate from it, as far as possible to do, everybody except Americans. They have now in some of these consulates people working for \$400 to \$600 a year who are natives of the country in which the consulates are located, and it has been the purpose of the department for quite a number of years to eliminate the foreign employees and fill our consulates with Americans. That has been done to some extent already, and appropriations have been increased for that purpose. I can not say exactly how much we will use for that purpose, but enough will be used to carry that into effect and the balance of it for the giving of more clerical force to these consulates which the department does not think have a sufficient clerical force. In many instances the consuls have to do the clerical work and can not get around sufficiently to gather information valuable to the department and to our mercantile people.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the report of the department that is included on page 11 of the report I find that the amount now appropriated would provide one clerk at \$1,259 for each office. Does that refer to the amount appropriated for the present fiscal year?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is an allowance of \$1,259 for a clerk for each consular office. Now, you propose to increase this appropriation nearly one-third, nearly 33½ per cent, in these pressing times of economy?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. We did not think this was an item upon which to economize. When the opportunity for enlarging the commercial influence of this country all over the world is so great, we did not think it was time to economize in our consular work.

Mr. STAFFORD. The question of enlarged activities is not involved at all. They have clerks, but they happen to be natives of the country in which they are located. Now you propose to send American clerks to those places and you will be obliged to send them at increased salaries. We have an item just preceding for 40 consular assistants at \$40,000, an average of a little over \$1,000, and yet you are proposing here, without any information as to the increased salaries to be paid to these men in these pressing times, over \$117,000 additional to be paid at the will of the Secretary of State and in a haphazard way.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is not haphazard and it is not at the will of the Secretary of State. It is in pursuance of a well-regulated system conducted by gentlemen who are familiar with the situation and necessities confronting our Consular Service.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says that will improve the system, and yet he has no facts to present to the committee when I asked him what the facts are.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I have stated the facts.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I asked him at the very start, and he stated that he could not furnish the information, as to how much of the increase would be occasioned by the substitution of American clerks for these foreigners, and how much for increased work. The gentleman stated he could not furnish the information.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Well, I can not furnish that, and that is a matter of very minor importance; very minor importance indeed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, very minor importance to the Democratic chairman of the committee that is appropriating \$117,000

more than the total appropriation for this item in the bill of last year.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. If the gentleman wants to clog the commercial prosperity of this country and our efforts to extend our trade in foreign lands, let him vote against the appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. There has never been any opposition by Republicans at any time to the improvement of the service; in fact, the reorganization of the service as to these clerks was adopted by a Republican administration about 10 years ago; but this is only a means of creating places and taking care of some favorites.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, that is too despicable an argument to call for an answer.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can not answer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a word?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Virginia knows that the gentlemen on this side of the House are asking the courtesy of that side of the House, which the gentleman, I know, is very willing to grant.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LINTHICUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 21201) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. POWERS, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of John Storms, H. R. 1480, first session Sixty-third Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. ALEXANDER, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Catherine J. Thomas, H. R. 16768, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of George Tederbaum, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On January 28, 1915:

H. R. 19076. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911;

On February 15, 1915:

H. R. 19424. An act to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge at St. Louis, Mo.;

H. R. 20818. An act to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River; and

H. R. 20933. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn., authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.," approved August 23, 1912.

On February 17, 1915:

H. R. 9584. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to sell the present old post office and the site thereof in the city of Jersey City, N. J.; and

H. R. 18783. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building and site at St. Petersburg, Fla.;

On February 18, 1915:

H. R. 16896. An act for the relief of Col. Richard H. Wilson, United States Army.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 17765. An act to regulate details of majors in the Ordnance Department;

H. R. 17907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge & Terminal Co., of Muscatine, Iowa, to build a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 17122. An act for the relief of John Burrows; and

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to postpone the sale of fur-seal skins now in the possession of the Government until such time as in his discretion he may deem such sale advisable.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 19376. An act confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington; and

H. R. 19545. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. HELVERING was granted leave of absence for two days, on account of illness.

PURCHASE OF SHIPS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the conferees on the part of the House on the bill (S. 5259) to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines between the United States and South America and between the United States and the countries of Europe: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PADGETT, Mr. HARDY, Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland, Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, and Mr. HINDS.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order made, until to-morrow, Saturday, February 20, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of the First Presbyterian Church of Darien, Ga., v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1614); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting schedule of papers and documents which are not needed in the transaction of public business in the Post Office Department and which have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 1615); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report of Winifred H. Osgood, Edward A. Preble, and George H. Parker, scientific assistants of the Bureau of Fisheries, on the fur seals and other life on the Pribilof Islands in 1914; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from the committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21441) to amend section 260 of the Judicial Code, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1419), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Utah, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21139) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to patent certain lands to the State of Utah and to accept from said State certain other lands in lieu thereof, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1420), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 409) authorizing the President to extend invitations to the Governments of Central and South America to appoint representatives to attend a conference with the Secretary of the Treasury in the city of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1421), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20738) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1422), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 413) to authorize the appointment of an advisory committee for aeronautics, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1423), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21359) granting the consent of Congress to the Citizens' Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Burlington, Iowa, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1424), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 21508) for organizing and creating an efficient reserve and defensive force of citizen soldiery for national defense from among the members of organized societies and fraternities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 21509) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to appoint a commission to negotiate with the Crow Indians for the cession of their lands lying west of the Big Horn River on the Crow Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 21510) to amend the Criminal Code of the United States by inserting therein a new section to be known as section 10417a; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 427) providing for the continuance of the Joint Commission to Investigate Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 428) for the appointment of a commission to investigate and report measures for the development of the American merchant marine and commerce; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 429) reappropriating and making available unexpended balances of appropriations for Indian reclamation projects in Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, urging the enactment of legislation compelling the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a good, safe, permanent bridge across the Missouri River at Chamberlain in said State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Memorial of the Legislature of South Dakota, urging the enactment of legislation compelling the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a good, safe, permanent bridge across the Missouri River at Chamberlain in said State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DILLON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, urging Congress to compel the Chicago, Mil-

waukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a permanent railway bridge across the Missouri River at the city of Chamberlain; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STOUT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the opening of the Crow Indian Reservation to settlement; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the enactment of a law giving title to all desert-land entrymen to claims filed prior to March 23, 1914; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the reestablishment of postal service to Cook City, Mont.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the payment of one-half the expense of building a bridge across the Big Horn River, in Big Horn County, out of Crow Indian moneys; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 21511) granting an increase of pension to John R. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21512) granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Reasor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERGUSON: A bill (H. R. 21513) for the relief of Frances L. Llewellyn; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 21514) for the relief of the heirs of Lidda Goff, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 21515) granting a pension to Dennis Ryng; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 21516) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Elmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 21517) for the relief of Benjamin F. Willis; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Petworth (D. C.) Citizens' Association, favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of Emil Meyer and other citizens of Brown County, Kans., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of citizens of Kingston, N. Y., and citizens of St. Louis, Mo., and vicinity, favoring an embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Union Biscuit Co., of St. Louis, Mo., favoring an embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of Linden Baptist Bible School and Church, Camden, N. J., against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of citizens of New York City, favoring exclusion of the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of New York City, against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petition of sundry citizens of Auburn, N. Y., favoring passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of citizens of Seneca County, N. Y.; Emil A. Linder, jr., and 76 others; George King and 26 others; O. D. Kane and 27 others; St. Andrew's Branch, No. 285, C. M. B. A., all of Rochester, and J. D. Waterbury and 12 others, of Lyndonville, N. Y., protesting against House bill 20644, press-muzzle bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of citizens of New Jersey, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petitions of sundry citizens and societies of New Jersey, favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of citizens of the seventh district of Ohio, favoring the passage of the Hamill bill, H. R. 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of St. Joseph Untereest Verein, of Little Rock, Ark., favoring curtailment of license usurped by Menace and other publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: Petitions of 75 citizens of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the use of the United States mails by the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 120 citizens of San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of residents of Burbank, Sawtelle, Los Angeles, Redlands, Santa Ana, Long Beach, Downey, Riverside, Escondido, Lakeside, San Bernardino, Glendale, Santa Barbara, Norwalk, and San Diego, all of the State of California, protesting against the enactment of the bills H. R. 20644, H. R. 20780, and H. R. 21183, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petitions of citizens of the fifteenth Pennsylvania district, favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDQUIST: Petition of Rev. R. A. Baker and others, of Ennican, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the proposed Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Charles Guiff and others, of Mount Pleasant, Mich., protesting against the proposed Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of George Matteson and others, of San Lake, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the proposed Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of J. P. Wierman and others, of Breckenridge, Mich., protesting against the proposed Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Charles Catzbeck and sundry citizens and members of the German School Society of New Britain, Conn., favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of 75 citizens of Otoe County, Nebr., favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Petition of Wurttemberger Untere Verein, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging legislation to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of citizens of McKees Rocks, Pa., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEELEY of Kansas: Petition of sundry citizens of seventh congressional district of Kansas, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Kansas, protesting against and abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: Petition of citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., favoring bills prohibiting export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Memorial of Ponevlezei Progressive Association, of Chelsea, Mass., favoring system of Federal, State, and municipal free employment; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of post office clerks of Chicago, Ill., against proposed Senate committee amendment on page 14, lines 10 to 20, of the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petition of citizens of Greeley and Brush, Colo., and other citizens of Colorado, against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Federal Club, Trinidad, Colo., favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petition of citizens of Sagerton, Tex., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 20, 1915.

(Legislative day of Friday, February 19, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19909) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fall	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Fletcher	Overman	Smoot
Brady	Gallinger	Page	Stone
Brandege	Gronna	Perkins	Thomas
Bryan	James	Poindexter	Thompson
Burleigh	Jones	Ransdell	Tillman
Burton	Kenyon	Robinson	Townsend
Catron	Kern	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Chamberlain	La Follette	Shafroth	Walsh
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Sheppard	Warren
Colt	Lodge	Sherman	White
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Shively	Works
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I was requested by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to state that he is detained from attendance at this time on the Senate by work upon the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has been called home on account of the death of a dear friend, and will be absent for several days.

Mr. RANDELL. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] on account of sickness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] on account of illness. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The pending question is on the amendment of the committee on page 124.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I desire to be heard very briefly on the pending amendment. I represent an agricultural State, and I make bold to say, notwithstanding the very great number of agricultural associations, granges, and other similar bodies in that State, I have not received one request from anyone in Ohio representing the agricultural interest asking for the adoption of this amendment, which is a proof to my mind that the farmers of the country do not desire it.

At this time, when the revenue is less than the expenditure, it seems to me we should hesitate a very long time before adopting any such amendment saddling upon the country so large an expense. I think the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] yesterday suggested a better way for securing these statistics. The method in vogue in North Dakota to which he referred, a report by the assessors, has been adopted in many of the States, and it is possible in that manner to obtain reliable figures.

I recognize that many of the reports have been altogether inaccurate. For instance, for a long time, up until after 1910 the statistics in regard to the number of cattle in the country were erroneous. The accepted figures showed no decrease at any time. But the reports made soon after 1910 showed not only a decrease in proportion to population, but showed an absolute decrease between 1890 and 1900 in number, and only a slight increase between 1900 and 1910. I question, however, whether this method will give us any more valuable statistics than can be obtained in other ways. In addition to that, the decisive argument to my mind is the very large and unnecessary expense contemplated by the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. KENYON. The yeas and nays, I suggest, have been ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. He is absent, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who is absent, and for the present I will withhold my vote.

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I have a pair for the day with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to inquire whether the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have a general pair with that Senator, and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator. I transfer my